DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 196 996 UD 021 069

AUTHOR Hood, Donald E.
TITLE Audit Report of the U.S. Federal District Court-Ordered Desegregation of the Dallas Independent School District, 1978-79.
INSTITUTION Educational Testing Service, Princeton, N.J.
PUB DATE 15 Jun 79
NOTE 104p.: For related documents see UD 021 068 and UD 021 070-071. Appendices may be marginally legible due to small, broken print.

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC05 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Busing; *Compliance (Legal); Court Role; Desegregation Methods; Desegregation Plans; Elementary Secondary Education; Magnet Schools; *Program Evaluation; *Program Implementation; *School Desegregation; School Districts
IDENTIFIERS *Dallas Independent School District TX; Texas (Dallas)

ABSTRACT

The United States District Court for the Northern District of Texas mandated that the report to the Court by the Dallas Independent School District describing its progress toward desegregation be reviewed by an external auditor. This report presents the auditor's findings for 1978-79. The auditor reviewed the report and conducted on-site visits to a sample of 89 schools. Findings of the audit verified district statements that progress was being made toward compliance: transportation of students was generally accepted by pupils and parents, and utilization of special resources through the creation of magnet schools was receiving the support of school administrators and teachers. Problem areas identified by the audit included the district's failure to include evidence confirming compliance, continuing difficulties with pupil performance in reading, and a need for more community and parent involvement in some aspects of the school program. Recommendations for continuing progress toward full compliance were made. Evaluative instruments are appended. (Author/MK)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED196996

AUDIT REPORT OF THE U.S. FEDERAL DISTRICT COURT-ORDERED DESEGREGATION OF THE DALLAS INDEPENDENT SCHOOL DISTRICT, 1978-79

DONALD E. HOOD

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

UD021069

June 15, 1979
ETS
Educational Testing Service
Princeton, New Jersey

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Donald E. Hood
ETS
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

AUDIT REPORT OF THE U.S. FEDERAL DISTRICT COURT-ORDERED DESEGREGATION OF THE DALLAS INDEPENDENT SCHOOL DISTRICT, 1978-79

Submitted by

DONALD E. HOOD, ED. D.

Educational Testing Service
Austin, Texas

Members of the Audit Team

MS. CRISTINA M. HOGGATT
MS. SHIRLEY L. SMITH
MS. JOEL PERKINS
MS. JANIS THUNEM
MS. IDA PENA

June 15, 1979

Providing administrative support at Educational Testing Service:

DR. SCARVIA B. ANDERSON, Senior Vice President
DR. REGINALD CORDER, Director, Southwestern Regional Office

Providing assistance in preparation of report drafts:

MR. JOHN E. DOBBIN, Professional Associate, Southern Regional Office

INTRODUCTION

The United States District Court for the Northern District of Texas, Dallas Division, issued a Final Order dated April 7, 1976, in the case of Eddie Mitchell Tasby, et al, vs. Dr. Nolan Estes, et al, Superintendent of the Dallas Independent School District (DISD). The Order adopted the concepts embodied in the school desegregation plan of the educational task force of the Dallas Alliance, a tri-ethnic committee appointed by the Court and drawn from the total Dallas community.

The Court Order of April 7, 1976, was highly specific in how the district was to be divided into sub-districts for study and reporting, the proportions of students of various ethnic groups that were to be assigned to schools of different kinds in various sub-districts, how instructional and administrative staff were to be apportioned among the schools of various types and districts, how special school facilities were to be made available widely to students of all ethnic backgrounds, how preferences of students and their parents with regard to majority-minority proportions in the schools they attend could be accommodated - to a total of fourteen major directives and more than a dozen lesser sub-directives upon which the DISD was to report its progress in an Internal Accountability Report, filed with the Court on December 15 and April 15 annually through the school year 1978-79. The DISD did indeed file such reports in December 1976, April 1977, December 1977, April 1978, December 1978, and April 1979. In each case, the report of the school district was arranged to match the Order of the Court, item for item, in sequence and format, to facilitate comparison of Court-ordered performance with actual performance.

One of the conditions contained in the Court Order of April 7, 1976, (Section XV-B) provided for appointment of one external educational auditor. On the basis of competitive bidding, Educational Testing Service (ETS) was selected to perform the external audit function. The audit was to consist of verifying each item in the reports of the school system pursuant to compliance with the Court Order. Stated another way, the "audit" was assumed by both the school district and the External Auditor to consist of an auditor's examination of the Internal Accountability Reports of the DISD and comparison of what the district says it is doing in compliance with the Court Order - with what the Auditor has found to be true in separately collected evidence. As a consequence, the Court has had before it, in each of the three school years covered by the Order, an accountability report from the school district describing its progress toward complete compliance with the Court Order of June 7, 1976, and an outside auditor's report covering exactly the same items and describing that auditor's conclusions about the progress of the school district toward compliance. So that the Court might enjoy the greatest convenience in comparing what the school district says with what the External Auditor says, this External Auditor's report also is arranged to match the Court Order and the internal report in both sequence of topics and in format of presentations.

There is in this report very little specialized language that will be unfamiliar to a non-technical reader - with the possible exception of names given to schools with special facilities. At every level above the primary grades, there are certain schools that have equipment - or curricula, or schedules, or teachers with specialized training - not found in all the

other schools of the district. They are special schools for which particular provisions are made to bring to them the students who need them most. In Grades 4-6, these schools with special facilities are collectively called "Vanguard" schools. In Grades 7-8, they are named "Academy" schools, and in Grades 9-12, they are known as "Magnet" schools. A Magnet high school, for example, might be one that has the special equipment and trained staff to offer computer training, while another might be a high school that offers career preparation in the creative arts.

Table of Contents

Introduction 1

Table of Contents iv

List of Tables vi

Summary 1

Recommendations 5

DISD Internal Accountability Reports - December 15, 1978-April 15, 1979

1. The number and percentage of pupils, by ethnicity, attending each educational center, including Vanguard Schools, Academies, and Magnet High Schools 10

2. The number and percentage of pupils, by ethnicity, being transported for desegregation purposes to 4-6 and 7-8 centers and to Vanguard Schools, Academies, and Magnet High Schools 15

3. Majority to Minority Transfers

   (a) The number and percentage of pupils, by ethnicity and by school, participating in the program 18

   (b) The transportation facilities available and the convenience of transportation 21

   (c) Efforts made by the DISD to increase student participation in the Majority to Minority Transfer Program 22

4. The number and percentage of Mexican-American pupils participating in the Minority to Majority Transfer Program 23

5. The status of the following programs:

   (a) The Early Childhood Education Program (K-3) 25
   (b) 4-8 Vanguard and Academy Programs 29
   (c) 9-12 Magnet Programs 40
   (d) Bilingual Education Program 44
   (e) The Multicultural Social Studies Program (MSSP) 49

6. The number and percentage of teachers, by ethnicity, assigned full-time in each educational center, including Vanguard Schools, Academies, and Magnet Schools 52

7. The progress toward affirmative action in attaining the recruiting and employment goal, including the number and percentage of new teachers and administrators, by ethnicity, engaged by the DISD 55

8. The current status of capital outlay projects and allocation of bond issue funds in relation to the priorities and programs established by this Order 60

9. The results of the district's annual standardized achievement tests program by school, grade (grades 2, 4, 6, 8, 9, and 12), and by ethnicity 64

10. Efforts made by the DISD to successfully implement the Order of this Court with regard to parent involvement efforts, staff development programs, communications and relations with the community, student leadership training programs, and provisions for safety and security (including due process procedures) 65

Appendices 71

List of Tables

1. Parent Involvement in the K-3 Programs of Six Selected Schools 26

2. Reading Levels at All Vanguard Schools in Grades 4, 5, 6 34

3. Bilingual Schools Visited by Audit Team 45

4. Bilingual Teaching Resources Found in a Sample of 13 Schools Visited 47

5. Parent Attitudinal Survey 69-70

SUMMARY

As External Auditor for the Court, under the terms of the Final Order of April 7, 1976, of the United States District Court for the Northern District of Texas, Dallas Division, Educational Testing Service (ETS), Southwestern Regional Office, has audited the Report to the Court of the Dallas Independent School District (DISD) for the school year 1978-79. In addition, the External Auditor has conducted on-site visits to a rotated sample of 89 schools to ascertain for the Court certain specified conditions in those schools pertaining to condition of facilities, curricular offerings, amount and allocation of education resources, and the involvement of schools with parents and community.

No important difficulties were encountered by the External Auditor in performance of the audit. School administrators and staff, both at the central office and in the schools, were cooperative and helpful.

The characteristics of the Dallas schools reported to the court in the Audit Report of June 15, 1977, generally continued to be true of the system in June of 1978 and 1979. Desegregation of schools in the district is, for the most part, being implemented without difficulty. Transportation of students for the combined purposes of desegregation and equitable sharing of specialized facilities continues to be accepted by the generality of pupils and parents. The DISD system for utilization of special resources through creation of Vanguard schools, Academies, and Magnet schools, appears also to have earned the general support of school administration and teaching staff.

Overall then, the Dallas Independent School District - as it reports to the court in its own statements of December 15, 1977 and April 15, 1978, December 15, 1978, and April 15, 1979 - indeed is making progress toward compliance in most areas specified in the court order.

The reports of the district continue to suffer a singular shortcoming, however, in the view of the External Auditor. In a number of instances, the district has indeed performed well according to the order of the Court - and has said that it has performed the specified function according to the order - but it has neglected to append to its report the evidence that confirms compliance. Impressive new materials designed to inform parents about certain new programs, for example, illustrate beautifully the kind of district performance in community relations sought by the Court but in the district's report some of these new materials are only alluded to in places and are nowhere appended to the report. To the extent that the district's compliance report to the Court becomes an instrument for public information, the district does itself a disservice by omission of handsome evidence of compliance in certain areas. The fact that this evidence is shared freely with the External Auditor still does not, in the Auditor's view, obviate a need to have it appear as a documented part of the district's own compliance report to the Court.

The External Auditor continues to find evidence (individual test score averages) of problems with student performance in reading; however, such problems are prevalent in schools all over the country. Even though DISD teaching staff and administration are making concerted efforts to improve the situation, students are still advancing through the educational system of the DISD with less than mastery of reading skills.

Some of the Dallas schools - at every grade level, but particularly in early childhood centers, intermediate centers, and in schools in sparsely-populated areas - are still in need of more community and parent involvement in some aspects of the school program.

The test data that were reported in this year's district compliance report to the Court were included in the December 15, 1978 report. The district-wide achievement testing program was changed from fall administration to a spring administration in the school year 1977-78, shifting the testing originally expected in the fall of 1977 to the spring of 1978. Thus there was a lapse of over a year when no test results were available. Different tests with a different reporting format were introduced at this time. Because of the change of phase testing, the use of different tests, and a variation in the score reporting format, it is not possible for the Auditor to utilize existing test data for the purpose of comparing average test performance year-to-year in the present Audit Report to the Court. The Auditor did not observe any effort by the district to implement appropriate statistical bridges in test reporting as included in Recommendation 3 of the June 15, 1978 Audit Report.

As mentioned previously, the lay reader of the district and audit reports, as well as some members of the school staff and audit team, are still not fully prepared to interpret in a uniform way two terms that have a central importance in compliance with the Court's ruling:

(1) "Due process"

(2) "Status"

A request for the Court's assistance in the resolution of this problem in semantics will appear in the recommendations section.

This report by Educational Testing Service is, as was its report for 1976-77 and 1977-78, an auditor's report. That is, it attests to the truth and accuracy of what the Dallas Independent School District has said about its own compliance with the Court's Order of April 7, 1976. The district has reported on its progress toward compliance with the specifics of the Court's Order, and the External Auditor has verified the statements of the district report, item by item, with qualifying comments. No effort has been made in this enterprise to evaluate the quality of education offered in the Dallas schools, nor has any attempt been made to generalize about the equities of the system with regard to ethnic and other cultural characteristics of pupils.

RECOMMENDATIONS

The DISD should be recognized by the Court for continuing to make general progress toward full compliance with the Court's Order of April 7, 1976. The district's reports may still have some shortcomings in communication, but they reflect quite accurately both the intent and extent of performance in compliance.

1. The Auditor again reports that materials that constitute evidence of compliance (pamphlets for parents, special notices and publications, visual and sound tapes, minutes of meetings, etc.) should be included as appendices in the district's own reports to the Court, rather than released separately to the Auditor. (It remains the Auditor's fear that unless such evidence is included in the district's own report it will not enter the public records with the same impact as direct reporting.)

2. The need to focus attention on the mastery of basic skills should continue to be a matter of high priority by the district. The results of on-site observations and reviews of DISD generated data reveal that continued, and perhaps expanded, efforts should be directed toward the mastery of basic skills at all academic levels.

3. The district should focus attention on the mastery of reading skills as early as possible in the educational experiences of each student. Students are continuing to move through the educational program of the DISD without demonstrating mastery of reading skills.

4. The results of the systemwide testing program should be made available to the instructional staff (teachers, instructional supervisors, curriculum developers, and others) at each building in a meaningful and useful manner.

The extent to which the skills measured by the tests used in the systemwide testing program are congruent with the skills taught in the classroom should be determined. Instructional activities should then be directed to those skills where test and curriculum agree and pupil performance is low.

5. The Magnet Schools appear to be providing the kinds of training for which they were established. The Auditor encourages continued efforts in: 1) development of recruiting procedures, 2) refinement of curricula, 3) expansion of curriculum offerings to accommodate students with varying interests and achievement levels, 4) continued involvement of the community for all programs, and 5) development of plans for improvement of physical facilities for Magnet Schools.

6. W. E. Greiner was included in the report to the Court as a new Academy. The district will need to consider redefining the geographic boundaries for Greiner if it is to serve as a districtwide Academy. There is presently no space available to accommodate students other than those already served by the school.

7. The school district and the Court should reach agreement upon their respective definitions of the term "status". It is the observation of the Auditor that this term as it is used in the Court Order means "how is the district progressing toward accomplishment of the prescribed quality or condition in the schools?" As it is used in the district's reports to the Court, however, the term is used to mean: "how many schools have the prescribed characteristic?" Perhaps both definitions of the term should be used, but the Court and the school district should interpret each set of data in the same way.

8. The intent of the Court Order of April 7, 1976, was to provide equal educational opportunities for every student in the DISD. This Court Order provided for an ethnic quota system in the selection of pupils for the

special schools. The Auditor finds that this quota system does not permit some student stations in the special schools (e.g., Magnets) to be filled because the composition (i.e., proportions of the ethnic groups) of the student populations in the DISD has not remained the same since the time of the Court Order. Therefore, in some instances, one ethnic group will have its quota filled and there will be a waiting list to enter a program. At the same time, spaces go unfilled as these are reserved for another ethnic group and members of this group do not elect to enroll in the program. Some students are thus deprived of the opportunity to enroll in schools or programs of their choice because the quota system does not permit it. The Court and the DISD schools should seek alternatives to the quota system if students are able to take advantages of the specialized schools.

DISD INTERNAL ACCOUNTABILITY REPORTS

December 15, 1978 and April 15, 1979

In its function as External Auditor, Educational Testing Service began its work from the base afforded by the two documents of December and April prepared by the district to report the extent of compliance with the Court's Order of April 7, 1976.

As in the previous rounds of reporting and auditing over the past two years, the Auditor used a variety of techniques to verify, item by item, statements made by the district in its reports to the Court. Information in quantified data form was sampled through a randomized system, but deeply enough to assure reliability of the sample. Also selected on a randomized basis were a number of topics for which data were traced back and verified in original source documents. Going one step beyond that for certain randomly-chosen topics, the data from all levels of reduction and summarization - tally sheet input to computer print-out - were assembled and carried into interviews with persons who had contributed personally to the creation and reduction of the data. Every topic covered in the DISD reports to the court was thus examined in one or more systematic ways. This Auditor's report indicates where the data were found to be accurate or inaccurate within the limits of error set by the Court.

One troublesome circumstance afflicts the gatherers of information about students in the Dallas schools: the student population keeps changing. There has been a continuing loss of Anglo students, whether from mobility of families or other causes. Thus the proportions of students of the three major ethnic backgrounds projected by the Court and the Dallas Alliance to be enrolled in the special schools of interest

simply cannot be achieved because there are no longer enough Anglo students to maintain the projected proportions.

In spite of the handicaps imposed upon the school system by the realities of a changing world, the Auditors--having cross-checked and randomly sampled and replicated and interviewed to review methods and verify results--have few criticisms of consequence but find a devotion to honesty and accuracy which is a pleasure to report.

From this point onward, the remarks of the Auditor depart from generalization and are directed, point by point, to the December and April reports of the DISD to the Court.

1. (a) The number and percentage of pupils, by ethnicity, attending each educational center, including Vanguard Schools, Academies, and Magnet High Schools.

In an effort to verify student enrollment figures by ethnicity at each Vanguard, Academy, and Magnet School, as presented to the Court in the December 15, 1978, and April 15, 1979, reports, the Auditor conducted two separate on-site visits to each educational center. Enrollment figures at three of the five Vanguard Schools--Amelia Earhart, Maynard Jackson, and K. B. Polk--were found to be basically accurate and substantially correct, with enrollment figures not exceeding in either direction the 5% variance allowed by the Court. However, the enrollment figures which appeared in the two reports to the Court were not substantiated by on-site visits for Sidney Lanier and Mark Twain Schools. In both cases, the numbers of students in the special programs were greater than the allowable 5% variance.

Trying to clarify the discrepancy between the data reported to the Court and the data acquired through on-site visits, the Auditor scheduled and conducted an interview with Dr. Wayne R. Applebaum, Senior Evaluator for Court Ordered Reporting on the DISD central staff, on May 9, 1979. Through an oversight, student enrollment figures for grades K-6, representing the total student population, at both campuses were reported to the Court in both the December and April reports, instead of student enrollment figures for the program in grades 4-6, which comprise the Vanguard portion of each school. After close examination of the same two computer printouts, the first one dated November 14, 1978, and the second one dated March 3, 1979, from which the total enrollment figures were taken for Court reporting purposes, it was determined that the variance between the enrollment figures appearing

on the printout and those acquired through on-site visits did not vary beyond the 5% limit which is allowed by the Court. A memo from Dr. Applebaum entitled Errata for Court Report which was dated May 9, 1979, and addressed to Mr. Robert Johnston, a colleague in the data collection office of DISD, provides corrected enrollment figures for both Sidney Lanier and Mark Twain Schools. (See Appendix F.) To the Auditor's best knowledge, the corrections were recorded at the DISD office but not forwarded to the Court.

Student enrollment figures which were presented to the Court in both reports were found to be basically accurate and in no instance was the variance, positive or negative, greater than the 5% allowed by the Court. Enrollment figures for the W. E. Greiner Academy, one which was newly instituted as of August, 1978, were inadvertently omitted from the December 15, 1978, report but were included in the April 15, 1979, report.

Enrollment figures for the Magnet Schools were verified during April and May, 1979, for both the December 15, 1978, and April 15, 1979, court reports. The on-site information was extracted from the C-56S forms in each school. Some variances were found; however, the discrepancies could be explained. The C-56S forms reflect enrollment on the date the form is completed and sent to the central administration building. The C-56S forms are usually made at the beginning and end of each school quarter. In the interim a person from data processing feeds additional enrollment and withdrawal information to the computer on a daily basis. Thus, the computer is updated on a continuous basis and would be expected to be at variance with forms that are made only periodically. The computer is not programmed to store information that is not current; therefore, there is no way that information can be retrieved after the fact. Each building is supplied

with a computer printout of enrollment figures, and any discrepancy in coding should be found by local personnel on each campus. Thus, with the built-in quality control, the assumption must be made that since the process is accurate, the product must be accurate also.

With the exception of the error introduced by the mistaken input for Sidney Lanier and Mark Twain Schools--the error found and corrected--discrepancies found between the reported data and those figures obtained through on-site visits were small at best. Enrollment figures reported to the Court in the December report were acquired on November 14, 1978, while on-site figures were gathered during visits during the months of January and February. Likewise, enrollment data contained in the April 15, 1979, report were drawn from a special survey dated March 1, 1979, while on-site visits were conducted during the last two weeks of April, 1979.

The degree of built-in accuracy in the data reporting system was found to be exceedingly high. Three main sources were used to collect and verify the reported data. These sources, each one lending support to the others, were: (1) Volume I, Appendix A, of the DISD report to the Court (the master computer printout containing student enrollment figures for each education center by grade level, sex, and ethnicity); (2) pupil enrollment forms--C-56E and/or C-56S--prepared by each campus administration and with copies on file at each center; (3) independent counts of students conducted by the principals at each of the schools visited.

The difficulties of matching computer-based data with hand-computed data, when the samples are taken at different times in populations that are in constant flux, lead to unavoidable small imprecisions in final conclusions.

This is a fact of life in research with "live" (i.e., uncontrolled) human beings. So the Auditor is not inclined to ascribe blame of any kind to DISD staff for the difficulties encountered in verifying the transportation data reported, but it is only fair to note that the passage of time and changes in DISD data processing staff since the first impact of the court order in 1976, seem to have been accompanied by a diminishing zeal for errorless data and unshakable conclusions. The data and conclusions in this section (1. (a)) are not quite as strong as they were in the first two years of reporting--though there is no evidence of any less intent to comply fully with the order of the Court.

(b) The number and percentage of pupils, by ethnicity, attending each educational center except Vanguard Schools, Academies, and Magnet Schools.

Appendix A of Volume I, the master computer printout presented to the Court, listed the number and percentage of pupils by ethnicity, sex, and attendance areas, by subdistrict, attending the non-Vanguard, non-Academy, and non-Magnet Schools (the "regular" or unspecialized schools). The format of the printout, however, did not easily lend itself to the random sampling check procedures which the Auditor had expected to employ in verification of the Volume I, Appendix A output. In order to rearrange the output data in a way that would accommodate the random sampling technique, the district would have had to develop and apply new systems of data collection and reduction. Such a change-over, according to Mr. Lloyd White, principal analyst in the DISD data processing department, would be difficult, inconvenient for everyone concerned, and expensive. Therefore, with the assistance of Mr. David Martinez, of the same department, an auditing procedure was applied only to the processes for collecting

and reporting the data. (The same procedure was used in this circumstance last year.) Using a separate but real set of pupil data, the whole process--from collection of original pupil information through all the steps to computer printouts--was observed carefully by the audit team. The process was found to be very accurate and the level of quality control high. The data reported in Volume I, Appendix A, therefore, logically can be expected to be accurate and authentic.

As the Auditor reported a year ago, declining enrollments of Anglo students in the Dallas system as a whole has made ethnic balances difficult to achieve, with the consequence that compliance with the Court Order with respect to ethnic proportions in the special schools has been only partially achieved. Vigorous recruiting efforts for the special schools continue, however, and reveal a strong intent to comply fully.

2. The number and percentage of pupils, by ethnicity, being transported for desegregation purposes to 4-6 and 7-8 centers and to Vanguard Schools, Academies, and Magnet High Schools.

Efforts to verify the number and percentage of pupils by ethnicity being transported for desegregation purposes, as reported to the Court in the December 15, 1978, and April 15, 1979, reports, were complicated by inconsistent student transportation figures and reporting systems encountered at sampled schools during on-site data verification visits. Out of seven randomly sampled Grade 4-6 schools in the December report, only one educational center's figures fell within the 5% variance allowed by the Court. On-site visits at Vanguard Schools revealed two of the five centers exceeding the 5% variance. Likewise, on-site visits to the Academies yielded information to the effect that two of these six schools were also not within the allowable 5% variance.

Verification of the April 15, 1978, report was also conducted through on-site visits by members of the audit team. Of the seven non-Vanguards and non-Academies sampled, three were within the 5% variance either positively or negatively. Four of the five Vanguard Schools exceeded the Court decreed variance while only one of the Academies exceeded the 5% variance. Two Academies told the Auditor that their files indicated no students were transported for desegregation purposes.

Because the disparity was so great between reported and on-site figures, the Auditor was left no recourse but to verify the transportation reporting process as compared to actual numbers of transported students. Verification of the reporting process was accomplished through interviews with Dr. Wayne R. Applebaum, Senior Evaluator for Court Ordered Reporting, and Mr. David Martinez, a member of the data processing department.

Student status relative to transportation eligibility is recorded on each student's Student Enrollment Form at the beginning of the academic year. This information is forwarded to the Data Processing Department and a copy of the form is retained by the school. However, throughout the year, often on a daily basis, information regarding changes in students' transportation status is reported to the Data Processing Department by school registrars. Addition or deletion of of students' eligibility, on a daily basis, is made and forwarded to data processing but is not noted on the student's initial Student Enrollment Form. Consequently, verification of on-site records were at variance with transportation figures reported to the Court. However, the reporting system used by the student reporting registrar at each educational center, on a daily basis, was found to be a reliable and valid process since the computer's information bank is kept current on a daily basis. Therefore, the Auditor concluded that since the information input and reporting process are valid, the product--computer reported figures of students being transported for desegregation purposes--is valid. The degree of quality control, as it exists, is the responsibility of the building principal. Periodic computerized printouts listing changes (additions and/or deletions) in student transportation status are provided for verification purposes by data processing. Errors, should they exist, are then identified and reported to data processing.

Again, as with verification of attendance figures, the accuracy and validity of figures for transportation of pupils for desegregation purposes have had to be deduced from other observations rather than observed directly from comparable data; the procedures by which this information is

collected and organized and reported appear to be accurate and well-managed--so the data reported out by these procedures must be assumed to be accurate and reliable, too.

3. Majority to Minority Transfers:

(a) The number and percentage of pupils by ethnicity and by school participating in this program.

In selecting a sample of schools participating in the Majority to Minority Transfer Program, receiving schools were selected which had either a high number of transferees or a low number of transferees. Schools selected from the December 15, 1978 report for on-site verification of records were: High Schools--Hillcrest, Thomas Jefferson, North Dallas, Bryan Adams, and W. W. Samuel; Middle Schools--Edward H. Cary, J. L. Long, T. W. Browne, and W. E. Greiner; Elementary Schools--Nancy Jane Cochran, Julius Dorsey, Stonewall Jackson, Preston Hollow, Edna Rowe, and Dan D. Rogers.

High Schools: Hillcrest High School was reported to have a total of 148 majority to minority transfer students. Of this total, 145 were Black and 3 were Mexican-Americans. A member of the audit team in an on-site visit found a total of 146 transfers. This represents a difference of 2 transferees from the date from which the December report was generated and the date of the visit.

Figures for Thomas Jefferson totaled 12 transferees--11 Blacks and 1 Mexican-American. A site visit on January 31, 1979, confirmed these figures. The on-site visit to North Dallas High School on February 9, 1979, substantiated that 10 transferees--2 Anglo students and 8 Blacks--were participating in the program.

Examination of reported data at Bryan Adams was accomplished through an on-site visit on February 7, 1978. A total of 148 (Black) students was found to be classified as majority to minority transferees, as compared with the 137 (133 Black, 1 Anglo, and 3 Mexican-Americans)

who were reported to the Court. W. W. Samuel High School reported a total transfer of 96 students--2 Anglo and 94 Black. On-site examination of transfer students yielded zero (0) Anglo students and 95 Black students participating in the Majority to Minority Program.

Middle Schools: An inspection of the Application for Majority to Minority Transfer forms revealed no discrepancy between reported and on-site figures at the Edward H. Cary School, the W. E. Greiner School and the J. L. Long School. T. W. Browne's figures of 58 students--50 Black and 8 Mexican-American--as reported to the Court were not the same as those figures gathered during a February 2, 1979, on-site visit. A discrepancy existed in that 61 students (55 Blacks and 6 Mexican-Americans) were found to be participating in the program. The reader should be reminded that the figures for the December 5, 1978, Court Report were obtained from the computer on November 14 and the audit visit was in February. The reader is also cautioned not to overinterpret discrepancies when dealing with small numbers.

Elementary Schools: With the exception of Dan D. Rogers and Stonewall Jackson Schools, the number and ethnicity of majority to minority transfer students in all other sampled elementary schools, which were reported to the Court on December 15, 1978, were verified as being correct. Rogers School was reported as having one (1) Black student transfer. An on-site visit revealed that no student was participating in the transfer program. Stonewall Jackson was reported to have nine program participants; however, an on-site visit of February 2, 1979, found ten student participants--1 Black and 9 Mexican-Americans.

In an effort to verify data as reported in the April 15, 1979, report, the Auditor employed the same sampling procedure as was used to select schools for purposes of verification in the December 15, 1978, report.

High Schools: Four high schools (Hillcrest, Thomas Jefferson, North Dallas, and Bryan Adams) were selected for an on-site visit to verify the number of students participating in the transfer program. Figures at two schools (Thomas Jefferson and North Dallas) matched those reported to the Court. At Hillcrest, a discrepancy existed between reported figures (136 Blacks and 3 Mexican-Americans) and those derived through the on-site visit (133 Blacks and 3 Mexican-Americans). Bryan Adams reported a total of 128 transferees--1 Anglo, 125 Blacks, and 2 Mexican-Americans--while the on-site visit of May 7, 1979, showed that 142 Black students were participating in the program.

Middle Schools: J. L. Long Middle School reported one Black transferee. This was verified through an on-site visit on May 7, 1979. Figures in the report to the Court for Edward H. Cary totaled 1 Black majority to minority transferee. The on-site visit, dated April 30, 1979, found 2 Black students enrolled as transferees. T. W. Browne reported 57 students (49 Black and 8 Mexican-Americans) participating in the program. On-site examination of transfer records indicated that 49 Black students and 7 Mexican-Americans, for a total of 56, were transferees.

Elementary Schools: Four elementary schools were selected for on-site visits (John F. Peeler, Julius Dorsey, Daniel Webster, and Stephen C. Foster). Only one campus--John F. Peeler--had on-site figures that differed from those reported to the Court. Peeler reported a total of 20 students (7 Anglo, 11 Black, and 2 Mexican-American) as majority to minority transfer students.

The on-site visit of May 1, 1979, found 10 students participating in the program--all 10 students being Black.

Most of the variances between reported enrollment figures and on-site observations of enrollment data were found to be within the 5% allowed by the Court. However, in two instances the differences did exceed the allowable 5%. The discrepancies found at Bryan Adams were larger in the April report than in the December report, and the variance between the reported and on-site figures at John F. Peeler in the April report approximated 50%.

(b) The transportation facilities available and the convenience of transportation.

An interview was held with Mr. Travis Johnson, the Dallas Independent School District's Director of Transportation, on February 2, 1979, for the purpose of data verification. Mr. Johnson verified the fact that transportation passes for the Dallas Transit System are provided where fewer than twenty (20) pupils are in need of transportation from one sending school to one receiving school. Furthermore, early and late buses are provided for majority to minority transfer students at the request of the Building Administrator. This service, which is conducted by the DISD, is provided to students outside the regular school hours to facilitate student participation in extra-curricular activities. According to Mr. Johnson, twenty-eight (28) buses were used to transport students who were participating in the majority to minority program, rather than the 27 reported to the Court.

On-site visits were made to verify a sample of bus routes at two separate compounds. Visits at the Cobb Stadium and the Earl Hay Compounds, both conducted on February 12, 1979, verified prescribed bus

routes and transportation facilities for the majority to minority transferees.

(c) Efforts made by DISD to increase participation in the program.

Verification of efforts made by the Dallas Independent School District to publicize, increase, and encourage student participation in the majority to minority program, as set forth in the Court-ordered transfer program, was conducted by members of the audit team. Copies of advertisements, school board publications, news articles by both the Dallas Times Herald and the Dallas Morning News, display posters, articles in school newspapers, and two brochures ("Building Tomorrow Today" and "Everything You Need to Know About Transfers") were provided by Mr. B. Rodney Davis, Director, School Action Center.

On-site visits to a sample of schools involved in the majority to minority transfer program and subsequent interviews with campus administrators verified the fact that adequate time was provided for students to enroll in the transfer program and that printed information, such as posters, brochures, and parent newsletters, were liberally posted throughout the schools. Evidence collected by the Auditors, therefore, clearly indicated that the District was making substantial efforts to promote the majority to minority transfer program.

change in geographic boundary directly affected four Anglo students in that the curriculum at Mills did not provide a bilingual program for student participation. Peeler, a predominantly Mexican-American school, offering bilingual instruction, and the original attendance center for these four students, could provide the curricula desired by the students. As a result, the four Anglo students were allowed to enroll at Peeler Elementary School as curriculum transfers in order to benefit from the bilingual instructional program.

Regarding the error in student ethnicity reporting, Dr. Stanley acknowledged an apparent incorrect coding of ethnicity had occurred by one of the data processing attendance personnel on the student's enrollment form. Dr. Stanley requested that this coding error be corrected and a copy of the corrected enrollment form be given to him for verification and record-keeping purposes.

The number of Mexican-American students participating in the Minority to Majority Transfer Program is very small and the record-keeping on these students is subject to numerous risks, but the DISD does keep the opportunity open as the Court directed.

5. The status of the following programs:

5. (a) THE EARLY CHILDHOOD EDUCATION PROGRAM (K-3)

Both the December 15, 1978 and the April 15, 1979 reports of the DISD to the Court on this topic state only:

"The Early Childhood Education Program (K-3), described in the District Court's April 7, 1976 Final Order, is in operation in all K-3 centers."

This year, as in previous years, the External Auditor is unable to file an in-depth audit report on the status of the Early Childhood Education Program because the district reports contain nothing to audit.

During on-site visits to a 13-school sample of K-3 centers in the spring of 1979, the Auditor's team found a wide range of differences among schools with respect to actual compliance with the seven specifics of Section III in the Court Order. During each visit, records were examined for purposes of verifying pupil enrollment and teacher assignment, the curriculum content of those programs described as special, and the degree of parent and community involvement.

Table 1 presents information about six K-3 schools drawn from the sample of 13 schools visited to illustrate maximum and minimum parent involvement. The pupil population of each school is delineated in terms of whether the school is predominantly Anglo or predominantly minority. Parent participation information was gathered in three separate areas: Partners in Reading, PTA, and Parent Volunteers--and was charted according to the number of parents involved in each of the three activities and the percentage of the total student population the involvements represent.

Both Allen (predominantly Mexican-American) and Withers (predominantly Anglo) schools showed 100% participation by parents in Partners in Reading conferences. Moseley, predominantly Anglo, also

TABLE 1

PARENT INVOLVEMENT IN THE K-3 PROGRAMS OF SIX SELECTED SCHOOLS

SCHOOL	Pupil Population							Parent Involvement in Selected K-3 Schools					
	Anglo		Black		M-A			Partners in Reading		PTA		Volunteers	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	Total	No. Attending Conferences	% of Student Population	Number Involved	% of Student Population	Number Involved	% of Student Population
Allen	48	6.4%	29	3.8%	677	89.8%	754	754	100%	180	24%	87	11.5%
Carver	8	2.4	314	93.7	13	3.9	335	159	47.5	23	6.9	24	7.2
Moseley	342	98	1	1	4	1	347	238	68.6	18	5.2	0	0
Travis	13	4.4	87	29.7	193	65.9	293	No figures Reported		----	approx. 95	125	42.7
Tyler	2	0.8	237	98.3	2	0.8	241	No figures Reported			100	30	12.4
Withers	118	87.4	10	7.4	7	5.2	135	135	100	160 **	100+	30	22.2

* Numbers include Parent Advisory, Volunteers, Tutors, and RIF Volunteers

** Number exceeds student population because each parent apparently was counted separately

exhibited a fairly high degree of parental involvement (68.6%) in reading conferences, while Carver, predominantly Black, showed parent participation of 47.5%. No figures were available for either Travis or Tyler schools. Three schools--Travis, Tyler, and Withers--exhibited total or almost total parent participation in PTA. The other three schools, however, had poor to very poor parent participation in PTA. The percentage of parents serving as volunteers in these six schools was below 13% in all but two schools: Travis with 42.7% and Withers with 20.7%.

In the area of curriculum and instruction, all K-3 sample schools were implementing the DISD baseline curriculum. Also verified was the extent and type of individualized instruction. All thirteen schools visited have individualized instruction to some extent. Programs include ability grouping within classrooms, team teaching, individual tutoring, and moving students to lower or higher grade levels in specific subject areas. Allen also has a Talented and Gifted program for K-3 students.

Prototypic enrichment programs appear to be primarily limited to educational tours or field trips. Three schools--DeGolyer, Marshall and Withers--also reported utilization of the ecological center, while two schools, Marshall and Tyler, reported using oral language laboratory facilities.

The Multicultural Social Studies Program was found to be operating in all K-3 schools sampled. The program is correlated with the basal social studies program and utilizes special kits developed by DISD. The one exception to this was found at DeGolyer, where the program consists of inviting guest speakers representing various ethnicities to present programs.

With respect to the sample K-3 schools for 1978-79 in the matter of partnerships with community groups serving young children, the external audit team verified that ten of the schools were participating in one or more partnerships, while three (Carver, Marshall, Moseley) were not.

Approximately one-half of the K-3 sample schools have reached or exceeded the 1:10 adult-pupil ratio goal specified as desirable in the original Court Order. An additional four schools are very close to the goal. Schools still needing to improve their adult-pupil ratio in compliance with the Court Order include Brown (1:16.6), Carver (1:22), Hassell (1:18.4) and Marshall (1:14.9).

The Auditor's filling-in of K-3 program information from a sample group of schools visited is not intended to fill gaps in the DISD report to the Court, but rather to illustrate what reporting on the "status" of a program amounts to. There is a plethora of information on the status of the K-3 program available in the schools, but it is the function of the district to report it and the function of the External Auditor to verify that report. On this program (Early Childhood Education, as discussed in Part III of the Court's 1976 order), the DISD reports of December, 1978, and April, 1979, are almost wholly lacking.

5. (b) VANGUARD SCHOOLS

The Vanguard program continues to be implemented at the following schools: Mark Twain, K. B. Polk, Amelia Earhart, Sidney Lanier, and Maynard Jackson.

Through on-site visits and personal interviews with the building administrator, selected faculty members, and students at each of the five Vanguard schools, the Auditor attempted to assess the "status" of the educational program as it existed at each educational center.

Mark Twain Fundamental School (4-6)

Mark Twain school has a teacher-student ratio of 1:19 with an enrollment of 334 students in grades 4-6. Of this number, 85 (25.4%) are Anglo, 235 (70.4%) are Blacks, 9 (2.7%) are Mexican-American, and 5 (1.5%) are classified as Oriental.

As expected in the fundamentalist approach to education, the basic curriculum of the "3 R's" is strongly emphasized. Extracurricular activities include French and Spanish Clubs, an Art Club, a Computer Program, and athletics. Tutoring and other instructional assistance are provided at the Guided Studies Center. Individual instruction is offered by way of ability grouping with peer and adult tutoring. A total of 18 senior citizens and 10 parents comprise most of the adult tutoring force.

Overall, the educational facilities at Mark Twain received a high evaluation status. Both internal and external features were deemed to be excellent.

Regarding discipline, there were 19 instances of corporal punishment as of February 13, 1979. Of those 19 students, 6 were Anglo and 13 were Blacks. Suspensions of 1-3 days were given to 9 students (2 Anglo and

7 Black). However, the majority of the discipline problems are handled through counseling and parent conferences and are academic in nature. A total of 332 parents are actively participating in the Partners in Reading program, but the exact number of parents who were members of the PTA was not provided by the principal. When asked why no figures were available, the principal merely stated that it was too difficult to do a breakdown by ethnicity of the PTA. Therefore, no figures are provided.

Maynard Jackson Center for Individually Guided Education (IGE)

Maynard Jackson has a teacher-student ratio of 1:24; 7 Anglos (1.2%), 665 Blacks (98.3%), and 4 Mexican-Americans (0.5%). The school's facilities, both internal and external, were found to be clean and attractive. This IGE school provides continuous and sequential individualized instruction with peer tutoring taking place both before and after school. Twenty-one (21) students (2 Anglo, 19 Black) are involved in a Talented and Gifted program which meets three hours a day, five days a week.

Approximately 300 students participated in the extra-curricular program. Program offerings include arts and crafts, typing, creative dance, drama, choir, athletics, and a computer club.

K. B. Polk Center for Advanced Studies

K. B. Polk Center for Advanced Studies has an enrollment of 119 students, grades 4-6. Of the 119 students, 83 are Anglo (70%), 30 are Black (25%), and 5 are Mexican-American (4%). In addition, all 119 are involved in the Talented and Gifted (TAG) program. Although much of the instruction takes place in self-contained classrooms, students also participate in the Junior Great Books program and take advantage of mini-courses which are offered each Fabulous Friday, on various topics such as painting,

medicine, plumbing and the like, and are taught by qualified members of the community.

Disciplinary problems are minimal, and individual student counseling sessions (12) were used to discipline academic misbehavior and transportation misconduct. No suspensions nor use of corporal punishment were reported. The 120 member PTA was reported as being very active, and many parents were involved in Parent Advisory (120) and worked as volunteers (29). Both Henry S. Miller and Sanger Harris sponsor activities and donate money for the purchase of books for the Reading is Fundamental (RIF) program.

The premises and buildings were found to be clean and well-kept. Facilities were rated as good, while recreational facilities and fire extinguishers were rated as adequate.

Sidney Lanier Center for the Expressive Arts

The Sidney Lanier Vanguard has a teacher-student ratio of 1:28 with a total student population of 472. The enrollment represents 92 Anglos (19.5%), 79 Blacks (16.7%), 291 Mexican-Americans (61.7%), and 10 "Other" (2.1%).

Externally, the school was considered to be in good to excellent condition; however, lighting, recreational areas and equipment, and parking areas rated inadequate. Internally, the building was generally rated good to excellent.

The curriculum features baseline subjects--language arts, social studies, mathematics, and science--as a basis for the program. Music, art, and drama play prominent roles. Drama clusters exist for the express purposes of training students to be actors, stage set designers, make up technicians, and the like. After-school activities are primarily in athletics.

Discipline problems are limited with most misbehavior being taken care of through counseling sessions. As of February 1, 1979, a total of 21 students (4 Anglo, 6 Black, and 11 Mexican-American) received suspensions lasting from one to three days.

Parental involvement at Sidney Lanier is minimal. A total of 20 parents were involved in Parent Advisory, 15 served as volunteers, and 3 as tutors. No figures were available for PTA.

Amelia Earhart Montessori School

The Amelia Earhart Montessori Vanguard has a total student population of 201, with a teacher-student ratio of approximately 1:20. There are 60 Anglos (29.8%), 95 Blacks (47.3%), 43 Mexican-Americans (21.4%), and 3 (1.5%) students classified as "Other". Overall, the external and internal features of the school were generally considered good to excellent.

The Montessori program was originally planned following the DISD baseline curriculum and further developed from there. The Earhart system is closely related to the Management System of DISD and, under the Montessori concept, each child has an individually designed curriculum to fit his/her specific needs.

Discipline appears to represent no real problem with only eight cases reported. Parents are required to come to school for conferences three to four times a year according to the principal, A. M. Erickson.

PTA participation is rather high with 102 members. Fourteen parents participate in Parent Advisory with 201 involved in RIF. Zales Corporation, under the Adopt-A-School program, provides adult volunteers and musical instruments for student use.

Reading Levels at all Vanguard Schools

The reading levels for all Vanguard schools appear on Table 2. With the exception of Maynard Jackson, all Vanguards reported student reading

levels by frequency count and ethnicity. Jackson was the only school that reported student reading data by percent by grade level. Therefore, conclusions drawn from the Jackson data must be tenuous at best.

With the exception of students in the K. B. Polk TAG program, the majority of Vanguard students are reading <u>below</u> grade level.

Table 2

READING LEVELS AT ALL VANGUARD SCHOOLS IN GRADES 4, 5, 6

School	Ethnicity	Reading Grade Level * Above	On	Below	Total Student Enrollment
Mark Twain	A	24	32	32	
	B	13	54	161	334
	M-A	0	11	7	(All students accounted for in breakdown)
	Other	0	0	0	
	Total = 334				
K. B. Polk TAG Program	A	70	14	1	
	B	7	16	7	119
	M-A	2	2	0	(All students accounted for in breakdown)
	Other	0	0	0	
	Total = 119				
Sidney Lanier	A	10	58	27	
	B	1	17	56	472
	M-A	5	35	221	(41 students unaccounted for in breakdown)
	Other	0	0	2	
	Total = 431				
Amelia Earhart	A	11	39	10	
	B	9	40	45	201
	M-A	2	21	20	(4 students unaccounted for in breakdown)
	Other	0	0	1	
	Total = 197				

Total Percents by Grade Level

School	Grade Level	Above	On	Below	Total Student Enrollment
Maynard Jackson	4	1.6%	26.3%	72.1%	676
	5	4.6	29.2	66.2	(Neither numbers of students nor their ethnicity were reported to the Auditor. Only percentages by grade level were available.)
	6	8.3	34.1	57.6	

* Reading scores were obtained from a number of different tests and represented the most current information available in each school.

ACADEMIES

The Dallas Independent School District offers five distinct programs for seventh and eighth graders through its Academy programs.

Pearl C. Anderson Career Exploration Academy

Students attending the Pearl C. Anderson Academy have a teacher-student ratio of approximately 1:13. Out of a total enrollment of 339 students, there are 126 Anglos (37.0%), 188 Blacks (55.0%), 24 Mexican-Americans (7.0%), and one student classified as "Other".

The curriculum is designed to develop career awareness through investigation and exploration of fifteen major areas of the world of work as designated by the U. S. Office of Education. Field trips are extensive, and the use of computer assisted instruction, paraprofessional tutoring, the math resource room, and contract teaching provide excellent reinforcement experiences. Extra-curricular activities include band, orchestra, choir, and a wide variety of club experiences (bridge, chess, etc.) on a weekly basis for each student.

Discipline problems are primarily handled through counseling techniques and parent conferences, 195 and 37 respectively. As of February 1, 1979, five students received a one to three day suspension. No corporal punishment was reported.

There is a total of 82 PTA members--40 Anglo, 40 Black, and 2 Mexican--American--who actively participate in school functions. Eighteen parents participate in Parent Advisory and 77 adults serve as volunteers and assist school personnel on an as-needed basis. Coca-Cola Company supplies some instructional materials and Schepps Dairy provides transportation for some school groups.

Sequoyah Academy for Environmental Science

At Sequoyah Academy there are 13 teachers and 174 students. The student population is composed of 70 Anglos (41%), 83 Blacks (48%), and 18 Mexican-Americans (10%), and 2 Other (1.0%).

Approximately 93 disciplinary actions (80 handled through counseling and 11 through parent conferences) were conducted by February 14, 1979. Reading scores for 169 students, out of a total enrollment of 173, were obtained through an on-site visit. Of the 169 students, 112 were reading below grade level. Sixty-seven of the below-grade readers were Blacks, twenty-nine were Anglo, and sixteen were Mexican-American.

Although the school building is old, the audit team rated both external and internal features as being generally good. Parking areas and recreational equipment were considered excellent. PTA membership is somewhat low with 18 participants. Eighteen parents are in the Parent Advisory and approximately 40 adults serve as volunteers and assist teachers and administrators on an as-needed basis. The majority of these participants are of Anglo ethnicity. More Black and Mexican-American participants should be sought. No adopting agency for Sequoyah exists at this time.

Oliver Wendell Holmes Classical Academy

Oliver Wendell Holmes has a teacher-student ratio of approximately 1:16 with 15 faculty and 239 students enrolled in the Academy program. Sixty-seven (28%) of the students are Anglo, while 157 (65.7%) are Black. There are eleven (4.6%) Mexican-American and 4 (1.7%) students classified as "Other".

The curriculum emphasizes academic excellence in language arts, mathematics and science for students with a greater-than-average interest in academics. Teachers interrelate all guides and classes to broaden students' understanding of their language and heritage. A strong student leadership training program is in existence. A member of the audit team verified that 92 students were reading above grade level (45 Anglos, 41 Blacks, and 6 Mexican-Americans), while 90 were reading below grade level (20 Anglos, 69 Blacks, and 1 Mexican-American). The remaining 57 students were reading on grade level.

The majority of disciplinary actions were handled through counseling techniques (42) while parent conferences (17) were also used to arrest atypical behavior. Five cases of corporal punishment were reported as of January 29, 1979.

Internal and external facilities were rated good to excellent. PTA representation totals 96 and J. C. Penney continues to function as the school's adopting agency.

William Hawley Atwell Fundamental Academy

William Hawley Atwell has an enrollment of 696 students and 33 teachers with a teacher-student ratio of approximately 1:21. The ethnic composition of the student body includes 223 Anglos (32%), 379 Blacks (54%), 89 Mexican-Americans (13%), and 5 (1.0%) students classified as "Other".

The curriculum stresses the 3 R's under a very traditional approach. Baseline language arts is currently being developed by DISD for Academies. Individualized instruction, both on an individual and a small group basis, is available before school begins and during school hours through teachers and teacher aides. Extra-curricular activities in athletics and music

(band, orchestra, and choir also exist. A total of 36 students participate in the Life Leadership Training Program.

Discipline constitute somewhat of a problem in that 58 cases of corporal punishment involving 10 Anglos, 40 Blacks, and 8 Mexican-Americans were reported. Seven students (2 Anglo, 4 Black, and 1 Mexican-American) received suspensions. A total of 19 students were counseled regarding misconduct.

The external and internal features of the building were rated excellent. Community participation in PTA is good with 300 members --105 Anglos, 180 Blacks, and 15 Mexican-Americans.

Alex W. Spence Academy

Alex W. Spence Academy provides programs for deaf and special education students (94), regular middle school students (521) and TAG students (122). The teacher-student ratio for talented and gifted students is approximately 1:20. TAG students include 78 Anglos (63.9%), 26 Blacks (21.3%), 16 Mexican-Americans (13.1%) and 2 students classified as "Other".

The curriculum is set up so that TAG programs are conducted during the morning. TAG students attend regular school classes in the afternoon. Regular students follow the seventh and eighth grade baseline curriculum all day. All students participate for one quarter in Occupational Investigation, a career education course. District enrichment programs appear to be well utilized. Provision is made for after school programs in athletics, industrial arts, homemaking, drama, and band.

Discipline problems are non-existent among TAG students. Instances of behavior requiring disciplinary measures among the regular students totaled 8 between the opening of school in the fall of 1978 and February 19, 1979.

There were 7 suspensions of one to three days (1 Anglo and 6 Mexican-Americans). One Mexican-American received a third party hearing.

External features of the building were rated as good to excellent. The one exception is that the school badly needs parking areas to be enlarged.

PTA figures were reported to the Auditor in percentages and not by frequency count. Interpretation of percentage figures without frequency counts is virtually meaningless.

The foregoing descriptions of "status" of the Vanguard and Academy programs serve the double purpose of reporting what the audit team observed in these schools and illustrating how the external audit team interprets the term "status report".

5. (c) 9-12 MAGNET PROGRAMS

The four magnet schools created by the DISD during the school year 1976-77 under Section V of the Court Order were the Business and Management Center, the High School for the Health Professions, the Transportation Institute, and the Creative Arts Magnet High School. To these original four were added two more magnet schools in the school year 1977-78: the Human Services Center and the Magnet Center for Public Services. Another addition was made in January 1979, when the Multiple Careers Magnet Center opened.

The DISD report to the Court of April 15, 1979 includes a detailed list of activities undertaken by the district to encourage young people to enroll in these special high schools; however, the district once again failed to append to its report copies of the well-developed and attractive promotional materials created to achieve this end.

On-site visits by audit team indicated that the district does intend to continue to refine and improve the Magnet Programs. Special emphasis in this year's program was focused on: (1) recruitment of students, (2) curriculum revision and development, (3) student placement in paid intern programs, and (4) the bringing together of students, employees, and parents in interviews.

In the course of the on-site visits, approximately 30 students in the magnet schools were interviewed, and subsequently interviews were made with their parents and employers or supervisors. All students interviewed were positive in their appreciation of the magnet school concept and reported favorably on the training offered. Students were especially appreciative of the instructional staff and learning environment in their respective schools. Individualized instruction and the genuine concern

for students by the instructional staff and administrators were the magnet school characteristics mentioned favorably by most students.

Examination of the enrollment figures for the magnet high schools showed that the self-selection of students for these schools still has not produced the racial balance in enrollments that was anticipated in the Court Order.

There remains a pressing need to strengthen the reading skills of many students in the magnet schools. Remedial reading specialists were observed at work in all magnet schools, but apparently the need is greater than was anticipated, for many students are being released into the job market with less than a mastery of basic reading skills.

The magnet schools should not be unduly criticized for the low reading level of students. The principal function of these special schools is not purely academic and, while they do provide a fairly generous amount of remedial instruction, they should not be faulted for academic shortcomings that students bring with them from other schools. Where to focus the remedial instruction that less skillful students need is a problem to be worked out by the district leadership; the magnet schools can and undoubtedly will carry a reasonable share of the load of remediation, but to require them to carry the whole load in a crash program of "catch-up" teaching of reading would threaten the central purpose for which they were organized.

It is the opinion of the auditing team that the magnet schools are succeeding in developing the kinds of programs mandated in the Court Order of April 7, 1976: providing programs of instruction that do indeed prepare most students for further technical and paraprofessional training

in post-high school institutions. Some students enter jobs directly upon graduation from magnet schools, but most go on for further training. Again and again, students have told audit team interviewers that the Magnet Programs have kept them in school.

The community of Dallas has provided much support for the magnet high schools; such support and involvement should be continued. Any developing concept like that of the magnet high schools needs time and some tolerance of errors to "work its bugs out". Dallas needs these schools and already has reason to be proud of them.

> (Auditor's note to the Court: In the Audit Report for 1977-78, it was noted in several places--with emphasis--that DISD in its reports was doing itself a serious disservice by so frequently offering the Court raw data without interpretation. In all cases, such a procedure is an unintended discourtesy to the Court, for it forces the Court to look up other references in order to be able to draw an interpretation for itself--and in some cases such a procedure allows the reader to move right past a conclusion most favorable to DISD, without taking notice. It is to be regretted that the district in this way again has passed up opportunities to give emphasis to its very real accomplishments.)

5. (c.1) Efforts of the DISD to encourage student enrollment in Magnet Programs.

On-site visits to all of the magnet high school programs by members of the audit team indicated that the efforts of the district to promote enrollment in the Magnet Programs were indeed as listed in the DISD reports of December 15, 1978 and April 15, 1979 (on page 15 in both reports). Not all of the magnet staffs engaged in every one of the activities listed, but all of the listed efforts had been tried by some of the magnet units and all of the units had taken part with enthusiasm in at least several of the promotional efforts.

5. (c.2) Course offerings in each of the Magnet Programs in operation.

On-site visits to all the magnet high school centers and interviews with the administrators of those centers confirmed the accuracy of the DISD reports of December 15, 1978 and April 15, 1979 in describing the course offerings of the seven magnet centers.

5. (c.3) The progress of increasing the number of magnet schools and their location in terms of the time table set forth in this order.

As noted in the December, 1978 and April, 1979 DISD reports to the Court, a seventh magnet school--the Multiple Careers Center at William B. Carroll High School--was opened to 120 part time students in January of 1979. This facility offers training in general construction, laundry and dry cleaning, home and community services, furniture repair and upholstery, and building and grounds maintenance.

Visits to DISD administrative offices confirmed that development of specifications for the Science and Technology Magnet in East Oak Cliff has progressed to the point of acceptance by the Board of Education. The scheduled opening of the school for the school year 1980-81 appears to be assured.

Preparations for construction of the Lincoln Magnet High School for Humanities appear to be on schedule; a construction contract of more than four million dollars has been approved by the Board of Education.

In total, implementation of the Court's Order with regard to development of magnet schools, and their strategic location at points of greatest need in the community, appears to be on schedule and headed for continued life.

5. (d) THE BILINGUAL PROGRAM

The December, 1978 and April, 1979 reports to the Court reported different numbers of existing Bilingual Programs at K-6 educational centers. The December 15, 1978 report lists a total of thirty-two (32) schools with existing programs while the April 15, 1979 report identifies thirty-nine (39) schools that serve pupils of limited English-speaking ability (LESA). These additional seven education centers were: H. Budd, W. W. Bushman, C. F. Carr, Casa View, Lisbon, J. J. McMillan, and K. P. Polk. Students who are eligible for program participation are those students who have been identified as lacking oral proficiency in English or as having difficulty with the English language in regular classroom instructional activities. The Dallas Independent School District uses the Primary Acquisition of Language (PAL) Test as a screening device for program eligibility.

Financial support for the implementation of the Bilingual Program comes primarily from two main sources: (1) The Texas Education Agency, which provides funds for instruction in grades K-5 under the Texas Bilingual Education Act; and (2) monies received under Title I, Title IV, and Title VII of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA). The Dallas Independent School District also subsidizes the Bilingual Program through local budgetary allocations. State regulations provide for Mexican-Americans who have been identified as LESA students; however, some Anglo and Black students may also participate in program activities on a voluntary basis.

The December 15, 1978 report and the April 15, 1979 report to the Court listed the names of schools, by grade levels, in which the Bilingual

Program was implemented. However, information relative to course content, instructional techniques, teaching strategies, and the use of instructional aids such as audio-visual materials was not provided as part of the report to the Court. In an effort to fulfill the audit function, on-site visits were conducted at thirteen (13) randomly selected schools in which the district's Bilingual Program was in operation. No attempt was made to determine the comprehensiveness of the program nor was there an attempt to assess the degree to which the program was implemented. Since no descriptive data accompanied either of the reports to the Court, no information existed to be verified. On-site interviews were conducted to acquire information about program operations with building-level administrators, resource teachers, and classroom teachers in each of the thirteen educational centers visited. The bilingual observation form used in the audit process is included as Appendix B.

Table 3

BILINGUAL SCHOOLS VISITED BY AUDIT TEAM

School	Subdistrict	Grades
L. L. Hotchkiss	Northeast	4-6
Obadiah Knight	Northwest	K-6
David G. Burnet	Northwest	K-6
Maple Lawn	Northwest	K-6
Gabe P. Allen	Northwest	K-3
Ben Milam	Northwest	K-6
Stephen Foster	Northwest	K-6
John Regan	Southwest	K-6
Leila P. Cowart	Southwest	K-3
Winnetka	Southwest	K-3
Julius Dorsey	Southeast	K-6
R. C. Buckner	Southeast	K-3
James Bowie	South Oak Cliff	K-6

The reader is cautioned that on an on-site visit to each of the thirteen schools listed in Table 3 was made on a one-time basis. Therefore, observations could be at variance from those which might have been based on a sampling of repeated visits. In each of the educational centers visited, efforts were being made to implement the Bilingual Program in accordance with the district's baseline curriculum. The Multicultural Social Studies Program was also being implemented in each of the thirteen visited schools. There was also evidence of the use of both small and large group instructional techniques. Each one of the schools used a Spanish-English bulletin board designed to provide visual learning assistance to both the transitional and monolingual students, and a wide variety of audio-visual equipment was used to facilitate the instructional process. Parent and/or tutorial assistance was found to exist in one form or another in nine (9) of the thirteen (13) schools visited. James Bowie reported the greatest number of parent and/or tutorial assistants (25) while four schools: John Regan, Maple Lawn, L. J. Hotchkiss, and Leila P. Cowart reported only one such participant. Four schools had reported no parent or tutorial assistance to students: Julius Dorsey, R. C. Buckner, Ben Milam, and Winnetka. Evidence of teacher-made diagnostic tests and instructional materials was found in all of the educational centers. In no instance was there reported a shortage of instructional materials.

All thirteen schools reported that they used Steps to English (grades 1-3) and Welcome to English (grades 1-5). Bilingual supplementary instructional materials, developed by the Dallas Independent School District and various commercial publishers were also used to facilitate the Bilingual Program. The number of certified bilingual teachers reported at the visited

Table 4

BILINGUAL TEACHING RESOURCES FOUND IN A SAMPLE OF THIRTEEN SCHOOLS VISITED

Parent Tutors	Team Teaching	ESL	Audio-Visual Aids	Books	Certified Bilingual Teachers
Knight 5	yes		yes	Steps to English 1-3	7 (2 in program)
Regan 1		yes K-6	yes	Welcome to English 4-6	4
Burnet 4			yes	"	3
Lawn 1		yes 4-6	yes	"	4
Dorsey 0		yes	yes	"	2
Allen 6			yes	"	18 (3 in program)
Buckner 0	yes		yes	"	4 (2 in program)
Milam 0			yes	"	3 (2 in program)
Hotchkiss 1		yes	yes	"	5
Cowart 1		yes	yes	"	5
Bowie 25		yes	yes	"	9
Winnetka 0		yes	yes	All	2 (2 in program)
Foster 3		yes			4

educational centers varied in number and ranged from a high of 18 at Gabe P. Allen to a low of two (2) at both Julius Dorsey and Winnetka schools. Five schools (Obadiah Knight, Gabe P. Allen, R. C. Buckner, Ben Milam, and Winnetka) had professional educators, ranging from a high of 3 at Allen to a low of 2 at each of the remaining schools, pursuing bilingual certification requirements. Some staff members expressed the belief that more instructional volunteers (parents and/or tutors) should be acquired so that more small group and individualized instruction could take place. Other professional personnel expressed a desire to see more certified bilingual teachers who could diagnose and prescribe instructional techniques and strategies specifically designed to meet individual student needs.

5. (e) THE STATUS OF THE MULTICULTURAL SOCIAL STUDIES PROGRAM

The status of the Multicultural Social Studies Program and the Multiethnic Social Studies Program was reported to the Court as being "operational" in both the December 15, 1978 report and in the April 15, 1979 report. However, no description of program content accompanied either report, nor was the reporting format and the disposition of each program, as it existed within grade levels K-12, consistent from one report to the other. The December 15, 1978 report stated that a Multicultural Social Studies Program was "operating" in all K-6 schools and that a Multiethnic Social Studies Program was operational in all schools having grades 7-12. On the other hand, the April 15, 1979 report stated that a Multicultural Social Studies Program was made part of the 7-8 curriculum, and that a Multicultural Social Studies course (elective in nature) was offered in grades 9-12. In an effort to clarify the reporting disparity, the Auditor conducted an interview with Dr. Wayne R. Applebaum, Senior Evaluator - Court Ordered Reporting, on May 18, 1979. According to Dr. Applebaum, information concerning the status of both the Multicultural and Multiethnic Social Studies Program was obtained from Dr. William J. Marks, Director of Social Studies for the Dallas Independent School System.

As the program information was obtained, including the format in which it was received by the internal auditor, it was so reported to the Court. However, it should be pointed out that, after several on-site visits to various K-12 schools, little difference was found to exist between the Multiethnic Program existing in grades 7-8 and the elective Multicultural course available at 9-12 centers. For the most part, the difference was found to be purely semantic.

Since no descriptive information was provided in either report, verification as to the comprehensiveness or adequacy of the content of the program was not possible. Therefore, the Auditor was able to determine only that some type of instructional program with multicultural content existed in all the K-12 grade levels. A total of ten randomly selected educational centers was chosen for on-site visits to verify the existence of a multicultural social studies program at K-6 schools. These schools were: D. G. Burnet, G. W. Truett, Bayles, H. Budd, R. Q. Mills, M. Weiss, L. L. Hotchkiss, M. B. Henderson, J. Bowie, and H. S. Thompson.

Each one of these K-6 educational centers did, in fact, offer some kind of instruction pertaining to multicultural social studies. Program activities largely consisted of supplementary reading materials, audio-visual-materials, instructional kits, film strips, cassette tapes, and field trips to local places of interest. No evidence, however, was available as to the effectiveness of the program as it was implemented at each of the ten sampled schools.

On-site visits were also conducted at both 7-8 and 9-12 schools to verify the existence of a multiethnic social studies program and an elective multicultural social studies course. Those middle schools which were visited included T. W. Brown, E. B. Comstock, J. B. Hood, T. J. Rusk, and E. D. Walker.

At each of the five middle school sites visited, the Auditor found evidence of supplementary reading materials used to correlate with textbook coverage of contributions made to the American culture by different ethnic groups. Such supplementary literature included: A Nation of Immigrants, History of the American Negro; The American Negro; Mexican-Americans; and

others. Additional instructional materials included puzzle maps, film strips, visits to local museums, films, articles in daily newspapers, and student debates on contemporary ethnic issues.

A total of six high schools, encompassing grades 9-12, were visited by members of the audit team. Those high schools visited were: David Carter, Thomas Jefferson, Justin Kimball, Franklin Roosevelt, South Oak Cliff, and Sunset. Some variation in course content exists at each of the six schools; however, all offer courses relative to Black and Mexican-American studies. Some schools offered courses in African studies, sociology, cultural anthropology, and Black and Spanish literature. Courses are "made" at student request and usually concentrate on areas of student concern. Since there are no adopted textbooks, reading materials such as those used in the multiethnic social studies program as well as audio-visual materials, film strips, newspaper articles, lectures from Bishop College professors, and trips to the Texas Legislature comprise the nucleus of instructional materials. Classroom activities are supplemented by outdoor carnivals at which students of different cultures prepare different ethnic foods and display various arts and crafts indigenous to their cultures.

Interviews with teachers at the sample of schools visited indicated that at all levels the DISD multicultural (or multiethnic) effort provides a wide assortment of supportive and supplementary learning materials that bear on the contributions of Dallas' major ethnic groups to the social fabric of the community--but that organization of these materials and suggested activites into a formal "program" of any kind depended upon the energy and imagination of the individual teacher.

6. The number and percentage of teachers by ethnicity assigned full-time in each education center, including Vanguard Schools, Academies, and Magnet Schools.

The responsibilities of the External Auditor were to: (1) verify the ethnicity and campus assignment of building-level administrators, and (2) verify the number and percentage of teachers, by ethnicity and campus assignment as reported to the Court in the December 15, 1978 report. To facilitate the Auditor's twofold task, a 5% sample of both campus-level administrators and teachers was selected from computerized printouts provided by Mr. William Morgan, Director of Personnel for DISD. A table of random numbers was used to facilitate the drawing of the random sample. The names drawn were subsequently submitted to Mr. Morgan, who provided the Auditor with the personnel files of the randomly selected teachers and administrators for the purpose of verifying their ethnicity as well as their job and campus assignment.

Personnel file folders of nineteen (19) campus-level administrators out of a total of 382, representing a 5% sample, were examined first. In the northwest subdistrict, Hillcrest High School, North Dallas High School, Arlington Park Elementary School, and Priscilla L. Tyler Elementary School were chosen. Northeast subdistrict schools chosen for verification purposes included Bryan Adams High School, James Madison High School, W. H. Gaston Middle School, J. L. Long Middle School, and Colonial Elementary School. Schools in the southeast subdistrict were Annie Webb Blanton Elementary School and Rylie Elementary School. The southwest subdistrict schools included T. W. Browne Middle School and Lida Hooe Elementary School. Franklin D. Roosevelt High School, South Oak Cliff High School, Harry Stone Middle School, and R. L. Thornton Elementary School comprised the schools in the East Oak Cliff subdistrict which were sampled.

Each personnel folder of the building-level administrator was examined for the purpose of verifying ethnicity, job assignment, and the educational center to which each adminstrator was assigned. No discrepancies existed between the information appearing on the computer printout and the data contained within the administrative personnel files as of March 15, 1979.

Random sampling was also used to select a 5% sample of full-time teachers employed in each of the six subdistricts. A total number of 315 personnel file folders were examined by the Auditor. Sampling procedures again were facilitated by a special printout which was requested by the Auditor and supplied by Mr. William Morgan.

In the northwest subdistrict, out of 1,198 full-time teachers, 60 personnel files were selected for the purposes of verification. The northeast subdistrict required verification of a sample of 63 drawn from 1,252 teachers. The subdistrict of Seagoville, having 108 teachers, had five (5) file folders verified. Out of the 1,105 teachers in the East Oak Cliff subdistrict, 55 files were selected for verification. In the southwest subdistrict, where there were 1, 179 full-time teachers employed, 59 were drawn by random sampling. Forty-four (44) files out of 881 were selected to be verified in the southeast subdistrict. Vanguard Schools, with a total of 156 teachers, had eight (8) personnel file folders examined out of a total of 161 full-time teachers employed among five campuses. The Magnet Schools, comprising 285 full-time teachers, had 14 files verified.

After examining each file, 37 files of the total of 315 teacher folders examined were found to have missing or incorrect information when compared to the data as presented in computer printout. Twenty one (21)

folders did not have ethnicity identified on their original application; however, ethnicity was identifiable through a photograph, copy of their birth certificate, etc. A total of thirteen (13) file folders provided no indication whatsoever as to the individual's ethnicity. One folder was not updated regarding a change in name due to marriage, one contained incorrect information as to which education center the teacher was assigned. And another one contained incorrect information due to the fact that two teachers had exactly the same name--information contained in their files had been interchanged--and therefore inaccurate records existed in both file folders.

There was, however, a disparity between the total number of teachers reported to the Court by the DISD in their December 15, 1978 report and the printout which was provided to the Auditor by Mr. William Morgan. The number of full-time teachers presented to the Court was taken from a computerized printout dated November 14, 1978 and indicated that there were 6,387 teachers employed by DISD as of that date. The printout which was provided to the Auditor, dated October 26, 1978 contained the names of 6,275 full-time teachers. During the period between October 26, 1978 and November 14, 1978 there was an increase of 110 full-time teachers. This increase in the number of full-time teachers falls well within the 5% variance allowed by the Court.

7. The progress toward affirmative action in attaining the recruiting and employment goal, including the number and percentage of new teachers and administrators by ethnicity engaged by the DISD.

On March 2, 1979, the External Auditor conducted interviews with the following administration: Mr. William Morgan, Director of Personnel; Mr. Edward L. Cowens, Deputy Associate Superintendent - Personnel; and Mr. Christopher Carrizales, Personnel Coordinator for Elementary Schools. These interviews were conducted for the purpose of verifying affirmative action in the areas of recruitment and employment of new teachers and new administrators. During the interview sessions, policies and practices regarding the recruitment and assignment of personnel were fully discussed.

During the March 2, 1979 interview the Auditor verified the comprehensiveness of the district's college and university recruiting program by examining copies of their geographic recruitment schedules and travel reimbursement forms. A total of forty-three (43) institutions of higher learning were visited by one or more members of the Dallas Independent School District's Department of Personnel. Within the State of Texas, a total of twenty (20) colleges and/or universities were visited by DISD recruiters. In addition to recruiting efforts within the state, personnel interviewers traveled to Illinois, Iowa, Indiana, Michigan, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, Louisiana, Arkansas, Oklahoma, Nebraska, and New Mexico to find qualified teachers. Approximately 23 colleges and universities were visited within this eleven-state area.

Recruiting efforts were expanded to include the state of Indiana during the 1978-79 operational year. This effort indicates an increase of one state over the ten states (Illinois, Iowa, Michigan, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, Louisiana, Arkansas, Oklahoma, Nebraska, and New Mexico) in

which recruitment activities occurred during the 1977-1978 recruiting season. In all, a total of 1,368 prospective teachers were interviewed during the 1978-79 academic year.

Special efforts to recruit minority teachers (Mexican-American) had been made throughout the 1976-1978 operational years by retaining the services (in the capacity of recruiting assistants), of four south Texas university professors: Dr. Benita Lowery of St. Mary's University; Dr. David Hinojosa of Texas A & I University; Dr. Kenneth Maroney of Corpus Christi University; and Dr. George Gonzales of Pan American University. During the 1978-1979 recruiting season their services were discontinued due to an increase in recruiting efforts by DISD's own recruiting personnel in the south Texas area. Additional efforts to recruit minority applicants included the use of brief radio announcements over approximately seventeen (17) different stations and recruiting advertisements which appeared in approximately fifteen (15) separate newspapers throughout the state of Texas regarding the dates and locations of interview centers for minority applicants. The Dallas Independent School District also belongs to the New England Consortium, which circulates information concerning minority teacher and administrator openings as well as interview schedules for interested applicants throughout the entire New England region.

An updated version of the slide-tape presentation entitled, "We've Got What You Want", accompanied by an updated brochure stressing the multicultural composition of the Dallas Independent School District, was circulated for viewing throughout Texas. In several south Texas cities such as Victoria, Alice, Harlingen, McAllen, Del Rio, Houston, San Antonio and

Laredo, motel rooms were rented by personnel interviewers to facilitate the recruitment of prospective teachers who found it inconvenient to attend interview centers at local college and university campuses. The overall cost of recruiting qualified applicants during the 1978-1979 season approximated $15,700.

The number of teachers newly employed by the Dallas Independent School District was reported as being 616 in the December 15, 1978 report. By ethnicity, the report stated that there were 455 (73.9%) Anglo teachers, 87 (14.1%) Black teachers, and 74 (12.0%) Mexican-American teachers, in this group. In an effort to verify the data reported to the Court, the Auditor requested Mr. William Morgan, Director of Personnel, to provide a copy of the computer printout containing the names, ethnicity, and campus assignments of those newly employed teachers who were included in the data presented to the Court on December 15, 1978. Close examination of the computerized printout yielded one discrepancy between data reported to the Court and the data contained in the October 26, 1978 printout. While the number of new Black teachers employed by the districts was found to be 87 in both reports, the number of Anglo and Mexican-American teachers was at variance by one. The report to the Court lists 74 Mexican-Americans employed by the District while the number of the computerized printout lists 73. Likewise, the number of Anglo teachers listed in the report totaled 455 while the number of names contained in the printout was 456. The apparent reason for this discrepancy in reported figures was that one (1) Oriental teacher was included in the Mexican-American count and deleted from the Anglo teacher tally, where Orientals ordinarily are reported. Therefore, while the total (616) of newly employed teachers did not change, the totals by ethnicity did tally and are as follows: Anglos 456 (74.03%);

Blacks 87 (14.12%); and Mexican-Americans 73 (11.85%).

Verification of newly-hired administrators, by ethnicity and job assignment, as presented to the Court in December 1978 report, was achieved through an interview with Mr. William Morgan on March 2, 1979. A total of seven (7) administrators (2 Anglo, 4 Black, and 1 Mexican-American) was employed by the District. A second verification was accomplished through on-site visitations to verify ethnicity and job assignment of each administrator.

The number of new teachers and administrators, by ethnicity, as reported to the Court in the April 15, 1979 report was found to be correct. Verification of these figures was accomplished through an interview by the Auditor with Mr. William Morgan. A second verification of employment figures was accomplished through the presentation to the Auditor of a computerized list of new teachers (144) and new administrators (2), by ethnicity. The computer printout listing new teachers was dated February 6, 1979, and the list of new administrators was generated May 10, 1979.

According to Mr. Edward L. Cowens, Deputy Associate Superintendent - Personnel, assignment practices are made in accordance with the Singleton case. However, if needs arise whereby the staffing of minority teachers becomes necessary for the overall enrichment of the educational program of a school, the Dallas Independent School District exercises its discretion to assign minority teachers at variance with the percentages established by Singleton.

Mr. Cowens also provided the auditor with a copy of "Supplement to Professional Personnel Guide" (see Appendix H) which was printed August 1, 1978. The "Guide", a comprehensive updating effort undertaken by the Personnel Services Department, includes an additional teacher-selection

"screening" procedure for the 1978-1979 operational year, listed on page 5, that did not pertain to applicants in years past: the selection and use of the Wesman Classification Test. The test score on the Wesman, test scores on the National Teachers Examinations, along with other data (interviews, college transcripts, etc.) will provide, according to the "Guide", the primary basis for teacher selection in the future. The ethnic fairness and culture "loading" of this new procedure will not be known for several years.

8. The current status of capital outlay projects and allocations of bond issue funds in relation to the priorities and programs established by this Order.

Both the December 15, 1978 and the April 15, 1979 reports to the Court, prepared by the Dallas Independent School District, describe the status of the selection and/or acquisition of five construction sites as mandated by the 1976 Court Order, and the status of renovations and/or modernizations of existing educational facilities. On March 6, 1979, the External Auditor interviewed three fiscal officers of the district: Dr. Weldon S. Wells, Assistant Superintendent for Support Services; Mr. Kermit Key, Administrative Assistant for Support Services; and Mr. Gordon D. Sentell, Chief - Architectural Services.

Under the terms of the 1976 Court Order, and with monies allocated by the 1967 bond elections, the Dallas Independent School District has made the following progress in an effort to comply with the terms stipulated in the Court Order. A site was selected and subsequently acquired in West Dallas (the Juarez - Douglas area) for the construction of a K-3 education facility and community center. The cost of constructing the Lorenzo de Zavala Elementary School on this site is currently estimated at $1,350,000--$445,000 over the $905,000 originally allocated for site acquisition and construction. The four year high school in the Seagoville subdistrict is currently under construction at an estimated cost of $7,000,000. This figure represents an increase of nearly $1,700,000 over the approved $5,300,000. Renovations at Hillcrest High School, which include a covered walkway between Franklin and Hillcrest, an extension of the stage in the auditorium, and floor space in the gymnasium and girls locker room, have been completed at a

cost of $1,300,000. Selection and acquisition of six acres of land for expanding football fields, tennis courts, and recreational areas at Franklin D. Roosevelt High School is nearing completion at an estimated completion cost of $250,000 ($148,966 over the original monies allocated for the project). Negotiations are now in the final stage for the acquisition of sites needed to provide adequate space for athletic and education programs at this high school.

Information pertaining to the status of the maintenance and improvement projects under the District's Summer Capital Improvement Program was incomplete in both the December 15, 1978 and April 15, 1979 reports to the Court. Due to an oversight, project status at the following high schools was deleted in the December 15, 1978 report: Justin F. Kimball, Metropolitan, L. G. Pinkston, W. W. Samuell, Skyline, South Oak Cliff, H. Grady Spruce, W. T. White, Thomas Jefferson, and David W. Carter. The April 15, 1979 report to the Court contained information relative to the status of renovations at eight of the ten above-mentioned schools; however, the status of project activities at both Jefferson and Carter high schools were inadvertently omitted from this report. Reference to this omission is found in Appendix G.

The status of improvements at Bryan Adams High School, Pearl C. Anderson Middle School, Sequoyah Academy, and the Boude Storey Middle School was described in both reports to the Court. The combined cost of the completed renovation of existing facilities was, as reported, approximately $1,000,000.

Due to a clerical error in compilation of the April 15, 1979 report to the Court (p. 33), it was made to appear that only sixteen projects for planning, contract award, or construction were underway at the

time--compared with twenty-five in the same categories in the December 15, 1978 report to the Court. Actually, twenty five such projects were in motion at the time of both reports.

Construction leading toward complete rehabilitation and/or renovation was in progress at four high schools (North Dallas, James Madison, Woodrow Wilson, and Sunset), one middle school (J. L. Long), and at seven elementary schools (Hooe, Milam, Brown, Crockett, Budd, Fannin, and Harllee). Renovations were completed at both the Harry Stone Middle School and the Ewell D. Walker Middle School in February, 1979. Construction of additional classrooms was completed at a total of ten campuses--one high school (Franklin D. Roosevelt) and nine elementary schools (Webster, Lakewood, Pershing, Burnet, Caillet, Foster, Rowe, San Jacinto, and Sanger). Progress toward complete rehabilitation of W. H. Adamson High School is underway currently, and renovations at W. E. Greiner Middle School and J. W. Ray and Phyllis Wheatley Elementary Schools have commenced.

The property at 912 S. Ervay (Public Service Center: Government and Law) has been purchased and renovated at a cost of $550,000. The Arts Magnet High School is being expanded some 15,000 square feet to provide additional classroom space. Similar expansion activities have been completed at the Business and Management Magnet High School, the Health Professions High School, the Transportation Magnet, and the Human Service Magnet. Architects have been commissioned to design three new elementary schools to replace the existing John H. Reagan, Kleberg, and Colonial Elementary Schools. Plans have been accepted and bids are being let for a facility to replace the existing James S. Hogg School.

Negotiations are nearing completion in purchasing the A. Harris Shopping Center which will be turned into the Nolan Estes Education Plaza. Site acquisition and architectural plans for the construction of two new high schools--Lincoln and the Science-Technology Magnet--are currently in progress.

Once again, as in their treatment of Question 5 (Summaries of Court-Ordered Special Programs), DISD has elected to report on status of capital outlay projects with such bare data that little interpretation with regard to progress during the current year was possible without going back to the cognizant district officers for interpretive help. The Auditor did this, in order that the Court might have a meaningful report on "What has been completed? What remains to be done? What are the cost over-runs? What new problems can be foreseen?" The phrasing of the question (8) on Page 20 of the Court Order implies a progress report showing status in relation to time and other factors; the two reports of the DISD dated December 15, 1978 and April 15, 1979 are lacking in this regard. Information filled in by the Auditor on the pages just preceding is, therefore, unofficial but intended to give the Court the sense of the record.

9. The results of the annual standardized achievement tests program by school, grade (grades 2, 4, 6, 8, 9 and 12), and ethnicity.

The results of the district's system-wide spring 1978 administration of achievement tests, reported by school, grade, and ethnicity, were included in Appendix B, Volume I, of the December 1978 DISD report to the Court. This spring 1978 administration involved the use of some tests not used previously in the system. This spring 1978 administration also followed a year during which no system-wide tests were used at all. Because of these conditions it is impossible to make an interpretation of gain or loss in test performance during the period covered by the Court Order.

Because the individual student test answer sheets from the spring 1978 testing had been destroyed by the time the Auditor came to make a verification study, the Auditor is unable to verify the accuracy of the test results reported to the Court in December 1978 by the DISD. In order to verify the general accuracy of the test scoring/reporting system, the Auditor requested a simulation run of the system using real answer sheets. This was done at a site visit to the processing center in the company of Mr. Richard Mallett, Senior Analyst for Test Processing, on May 24, 1979. Test scoring/reporting procedures at this simulation run were admirably objective, accurate, and readable.

The computer output bound into Appendix B of the December 15, 1978, report to the Court included score summaries for the district by grade, sex, and ethnicity, as required by the Court Order, and also included summaries for subdistricts and system-wide totals. This permitted the Court to interpret sex and ethnic differences in performance on these particular tests at this single point in time. However, changes in the district's testing program, as noted before, make impossible any interpretation describing gain or loss in test performance over the period covered by the Court Order.

10. Efforts made by the DISD to successfully implement the Order of this Court, in the following areas: parent involvement efforts, development programs, communications and community relations programs, student leadership training programs, safety and security (including due process procedures).

The audit report of a year ago (June 15, 1978) took special notice of the outstanding efforts of the DISD in seeking to implement the Order of the Court in all the areas mentioned above. Again this year, close inquiry by means of site visits, staff interviews, examination of records, retrieval of publications, and a survey of parent attitudes, indicates that the district has expanded its previously noteworthy communication effort and innovated in still other ways.

Possibly in response to a special "Note to the Court on Appended Material" in the 1978 audit report, the district this year has been far more careful to list in detail and describe its specific efforts to implement the Court Order in these matters of relations with students and staff and parents and community in both the December, 1978 and the April, 1979 reports to the Court. In its follow-up visits to the offices and officials involved, the Auditor has found that the efforts described in the December and April reports did in fact take place, in the numbers and procedures claimed for them--using materials which the district officials gladly placed in the Auditor's hands.

But once again this year the Auditor, while recognizing and applauding an information program that is worthy of national notice, must wonder why the district has not formally shared with the Court (in appendices to its reports) at least a sampling of the printed informational materials that illustrate the district's compliance so

handsomely. The Auditor has an extensive collection of these exemplary materials. The Court should have one, too.

The Parent-Student Attitudinal Survey

In order that the External Auditor might obtain some "fresh" or direct evidence bearing on the way the school desegregation efforts of the district are perceived by the parents of the students involved, a short interview schedule was designed and used as the basis for interviews with a small sample of parents. The results of this survey, conducted during early June, 1979, are presented in Table 5.

The obligation of the Auditor, under the contract with the Court, required a sample of only 25 families to be interviewed. Because the Auditor was concerned that a sample of this size was so small, the Auditor extended his efforts to attempt to reach a sample of seventy-three families. A portion of this sample was selected randomly from among all schools visited; the remainder was selected purposely to supplement information obtained in interviews with students.

Of the sample of seventy-three families, the audit team was unable to contact eighteen families and an additional five parents did not complete the interview. Therefore, the results that follow represent responses from fifty parents--twenty Anglo, eleven Black, and nineteen Mexican-American.

The Survey, presented in questionnaire format, was composed of eighteen questions. The instrument included five basic areas of concern: (1) the general educational atmosphere; (2) the degree of parental involvement; (3) the perceived progress toward desegregation; (4) the quality of the curriculum, the teachers, and the administration; and (5) the nature and scope of extracurricular offerings. A copy of the questionnaire appears in Appendix E.

The overall reaction of those sampled was generally favorable to the court-ordered desegregation program. With five or fewer exceptions, parents interviewed indicated that they were satisfied with their child's educational progress (Item #1 of the Attitudinal Survey Questionnaire) and that their child liked his/her school (#10); that they were aware of the Majority to Minority Program (#4), that they had visited their child's new school (#6) and found that both the course offerings and curriculum were adequate (#8 and #16); and that the quality of both teachers and administrators was better at the new school (#11 and #12). Highly positive reactions were also expressed with regard to gains in multicultural knowledge (#3) and the extent of sufficiency of extracurricular offerings (#17). A slightly less positive reaction among parents was found with regard to their child's participation in extracurricular offerings (#18).

A majority of parents surveyed agreed that they were generally satisfied with the implementation of the desegregation plan (#2) and felt that desegregation had resulted in an improved educational atmosphere (#5). A majority also expressed positive opinions with regard to the adequacy of facilities (#9). There were specific criticisms of James Bowie School with regard to the age of the building, broken glass in the area, and inadequate play equipment. Specific criticisms leveled at the Business Magnet included the age of the building, poor condition of steps, and the lack of a gymnasium and outdoor play area.

By only a slight majority, parents agreed that transportation facilities were adequate (#13). Twelve parents noted that their children either walked to school or provided their own transportation. Specific complaints included overcrowded buses and inadequate or undependable schedules.

With regard to discipline, a majority of parents sampled agreed that there were fewer discipline problems at their child's new school (#14) and that punishments tended to be milder (#15). Sixteen parents, however, failed to characterize the degree of severity of punishments.

Results of the survey also attest to the fact that a slight majority of the parents surveyed were active in parent organizations (#7). Those unable to be active cited reasons associated with work commitments, illness, language barriers, and lack of transportation.

Table 5

PARENT ATTITUDINAL SURVEY

Questions	N/A	Grade Level	Responses by Ethnicity: Yes A	Yes B	Yes M/A	No A	No B	No M/A	Total Yes	Total No	Grand Total
1. Satisfaction with education progress		K-3	2	1	2	1			5	1	
		4-6	5	3	5				13		
		7-8	2	2	3	1			7	1	
		9-12	9	8	5	1			22	1	
Totals									47	3	50
2. Satisfaction with desegregation implementation	1	K-3	2		1		1	1	3	2	
	1	4-6	4	2	5	1			11	1	
		7-8	2		1	1	2	2	3	5	
		9-12	7	3	5	3	4	1	15	8	
Totals									32	16	50
3. Multicultural knowledge with desegregation	1	K-3	3		2				5		
		4-6	5	2	5		1		12	1	
		7-8	3	2	2			1	7	1	
		9-12	7	6	5	3	2		18	5	
Totals									42	7	50
4. Awareness of majority to minority program		K-3	2	1	1	1		1	4	2	
		4-6	4	2	5	1	1		11	2	
		7-8	3	2	3				8		
		9-12	10	7	5		1		22	1	
Totals									45	5	50
5. Improved educational atmosphere with desegregation	1	K-3	3	1	1				5		
	1	4-6	4	2	5	1			11	1	
		7-8	2	2	1	1		2	5	3	
	3	9-12	6	4	5	3	2		15	5	
Totals									36	9	50
6. Visitation to new school		K-3	3	1	2				6		
		4-6	5	2	5		1		12	1	
		7-8	3	2	2			1	7	1	
		9-12	10	8	4			1	22	1	
Totals									47	3	50
7. Active participation in parent organization		K-3	2		1	1	1	1	3	3	
		4-6	4	2	3	1	1	2	9	4	
		7-8	3	2				3	5	3	
		9-12	6	3	4	4	5	1	13	10	
Totals									30	20	50
8. Adequate course offerings		K-3	3	1	2				6		
		4-6	5	3	5				13		
		7-8	2	2	2	1		1	6	2	
		9-12	10	7	5		1		22	1	
Totals									47	3	50
9. Adequate facilities		K-3	2	1	2	1			5	1	
		4-6	4	3	5	1			12	1	
		7-8	3	2	2			1	7	1	
	1	9-12	5	4	5	5	3		14	8	
Totals									38	11	50
10. Child's satisfaction		K-3	2	1	2	1			5	1	
		4-6	5	3	5				13		
		7-8	3	2	3				8		
		9-12	10	8	5				23		
Totals									49	1	50
11. Better Teaching quality at new school		K-3	3	1	2				6		
		4-6	5	3	5				13		
		7-8	2	1	3	1	1		6	2	
	3	9-12	6	7	5	1	1		18	2	
Totals									43	4	50
12. Better administrative quality at new school		K-3	3	1	2				6		
		4-6	5	3	5				13		
		7-8	2	1	3	1	1		6	2	
	1	9-12	6	7	5	2			20	2	
Totals									45	4	50
13. Adequate transportation facilities	1	K-3	1	1					2		
		4-6	2	1	3	3	1		6	4	
		7-8	2				1		2	1	
	12** 3	9-12	6	5	4	1	2	1	15	4	
Totals									25	9	50

TABLE 5 - Continued

14. Fewer discipline problems at new school		K-3	2	1	1	1		1	4	2			
		4-6	4	3	4	1		1	11	2			
		7-8	2	2	2	1		1	6	2			
	4	9-12	6	5	5	2	1		16	3			
Totals									37	9	50		
15. Milder punishments at new school	3	K-3	2		1				2	1			
	3	4-6	3	3	4				10				
	3	7-8	3	1	1				5				
	7	9-12	7	3	5	1			15	1			
Totals									32	2	50		
16. Adequate curriculum	1	K-3	2	1	1	1			4	1			
		4-6	5	3	5				13				
	1	7-8	3	2	2				7				
	2	9-12	8	6	5	2			19	1			
Totals									43	3	50		
17. Sufficient extracurricular offerings		K-3	2	1	1			2	4	2			
		4-6	5	2	5		1		12	1			
	1	7-8	3	2	2				7				
		9-12	8	4	5	2	4		17	6			
Totals									40	9	50		
18. Child's extracurricular participation		K-3	2	1		1		2	3	3			
		4-6	5	2	5		1		12	1			
		7-8	1	2	2	2		1	5	3			
	2	9-12	8	4	5	2	2		17	4			
Totals									37	11	50		

* N/A - No Response
** Question 13 - 9 walk, 3 own transportation

APPENDICES

SURVEY OF D. I. S. D. SCHOOLS

(in compliance with Court Order
CA-3-4211-C Item XV Sect; B_2).

Grade _____ to _____

Name of School _____ Principal _____

Address _____ Sub-District _____

Phone No.: _____ Capacity _____ Enrollment _____

Observer _____ Date _____

I STAFF

Teacher-Student Ratio _____: Adult-Student Ratio: _____

	Anglo %	Black %	M-A %	Other %	Total
A. Teaching Staff					
Support Staff					
Students					

Comments _____

B. C-56 S (Composite) LIST OF STAFF

STAFF	Anglo	Black	Mexican-American	Other	Total
Principal					
Intern Admin/ Asst Principal					
Counselors					
Vocational Counselors					
Librarians					
Nurses					
Nurses Aides					
Special Ed. Teachers					
Vocational Teachers (Bonus)					
Orchestra Teacher					
Classroom Teachers					
Classroom Teachers (Bonus)					
Registrar					
Study Hall Teachers					
Military Personnel					
Min. Found. Prog. Aide					
Aides in Lieu of Teachers					
Other Teacher Aides					
Secretaries					
Library Clerks					
Attendance/ Principal Clerks					
Building/Data Processing Clerk					
Counselor Clerks					
Research & Evaluation Observer					
Campus Officers					
Comm. Relations Cluster Staff					
Dir. Development					
Resource Teachers					
Liaison					
Youth Advisor					

C. EVALUATION: D.I.S.D. Principal-Teacher Conference

Comments _____

_____

D. ASSIGNMENTS: D.I.S.D. No. _____ Principal _____ No. _____

Comments _____

_____

E. TRANSFERS: IN _____ OUT _____

Comments _____

_____

F. CERTIFICATION: All _____ Some _____ Special Teaching Permit _____

Comments _____

_____

G. DEVELOPMENT PLAN: Principal's Copy ___ Implementation ___ No. of times per year ___

Content _____

Comments _____

_____

_____

H. COUNSELORS: No. of Students Counseled Requirement ___ Exit ___ Entrance ____

Magnets _____ Career Development Centers ____ Curriculum Transfers ___

Majority-Minority Transfer _____ Minority-Majority Transfer _____

Comments _____

_____

_____

II STUDENTS

A. ATTENDANCE: Actual _____ December Report _____

B. DISCIPLINE:

	Anglo %	Black %	M-A %	Other %	Total
Corporal Punishment					
Counseling					
Parent Conferences					
Suspensions (1-3 days)					
Juvenile Court Referrals					
Alternative Ed. Programs					
Third Party					

Comments _____

_____

_____

C. CURRICULUM TRANSFERS

Comments _____

_____

_____

D. READING LEVELS

2				
3				
4				
5				
6				
10				
12				

Comments _____

_____

E. INDIVIDUAL INSTRUCTION

GRADES					
	K				
	1				
	2				
	3				
	4				
	5				
	6				
	7				
	8				
	9				
	10				
	11				
	12				

Comments _____

_____

_____

F. STUDENT LEADERSHIP TRAINING PROGRAM

Anglo	Black	M-A	Other	Total

Comments

G. EXTRA-CURRICULAR PROGRAM

1. _____
2. _____
3. _____
4. _____
5. _____

Anglo	Black	M-A	Other	Total

Comments

R.O.T.C.

Comments

III. CURRICULUM

A. BASELINE SUBJECTS

	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Grades
Language Arts														
Social Studies														
Mathematics														
Science														

Comments

B. CAREER EDUCATION COURSES

	Anglo	%	Black	%	M-A	%	Other	%	Total
Industrial Cooperative Training									
Distributive Education									
Vocational Office Education									
Coop. Vocational Adv. Education									
Home Economic Coop Education									
Health Occupation									
Cosmetology									
Pre-Employment Child Care									
Auto-Mechanics									
General Contracting (CVA)									
Radio-TV									

Comments _____

C. INDIVIDUALIZED INSTRUCTION

How implemented?

Comments _____

D. HONORS

	Anglo	%	Black	%	M-A	%	Other	%	Total

Comments _____

E. FEDERALLY FUNDED PROGRAMS

E.S.E.A. TITLE I					
II					
III					
IV					
VI					
VII					
Bilingual Reading					
Tutoring					
TITLE I Deaf Project					
Project Kids					
Career Education					

Comments _____

F. MULTI-CULTURAL STUDIES

SUBJECTS	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Grades

Comments _____

_____

_____

G. PARTNERS IN READING

	Anglo	%	Black	%	M-A	%	Other	%	Total
Students									
Parents									
Parents Involvement									
Parent Advocates									
Parent Adv. Needed									

Comments _____

_____

_____

H. PHOTOTYPIC ENRICHMENT PROGRAMS

	YES	NO
Mexican American Heritage Center	____	____
Afro-American Heritage Center	____	____
Ecological Center	____	____
Oral Language Lab	____	____
Educational Tours	____	____

Comments _____

_____

_____

IV FACILITIES

MEASUREMENT SCALE

1. Excellent
2. Good
3. Adequate
4. Inadequate
5. Poor

O Non-Existent
N.A. Not Applicable

OBSERVER: _____

EXTERNAL FEATURES

A. GROUNDS

1. General Appearance ___
2. Landscaping ___
3. Sidewalks ___
4. Pathways ___
5. Parking Area ___
6. Fencing ___
7. Lighting ___
8. Recreational Area ___
9. Recreational Equipment ___
10. Sign posts ___
11. Security ___
12. Garbage Receptacles ___

B. BUILDINGS

1. General Appearance ___
2. Lighting ___
3. Brickwork ___
4. Woodwork ___
5. Trimmings ___
6. Roofing ___
7. Security ___
8. Gutters ___
9. Drainage ___
10. Ducts-ventilation ___
    -exhaust ___
11. Safety ___
12. Windows ___
    ___

Name of Observer _____

Date of Observation _____

INTERNAL FEATURES

C. INTERIOR

1. General Appearance
2. Lighting
3. Walls (painted)
4. Hallways
5. Lockers
6. Offices
7. Garbage Receptacles
8. Dining Facilities
9. Doors
10. Drinking Fountains
11. Space Allocation
12. Rest Rooms
13. Plumbing
14. Heating System
15. Electrical System
16. Air Conditioning
17. Ventilation
18. Stairways
19. Balconies
20. Library
21. Notice/Poster Boards
22. Furnishings
23. Storage Areas
24. Fire Exits
25. Fire Extinguishers
26. Gymnasium (Male & Female)

D. CLASSROOM

1. General Appearance
2. Lighting
3. Safety
4. Doors
5. Identification Symbols
6. Security
7. Carpeting
8. Floors
9. Waste Baskets
10. Windows
11. Ventilation
12. Heating Cooling System
13. Air Conditioning
14. Electrical Outlets
15. Equipment-Mobile
    -Stationary
16. Chalkboards
17. Notice/Poster Boards
18. Cupboards
19. Bookshelves
20. Chairs
21. Desks
22. Space Allocation
23. Storage Area
24. Fire Extinguishers

V. TRANSPORTATION

ACTUAL _____ DECEMBER REPORT _____ IN _____ OUT _____

A. STUDENTS

Schools	Anglo %	Black %	M-A %	Other %	Total
Vanguards					
Academies					
Business Magnet					
Arts					
Health Professions					
Transportation					

Comments _____

B. TRANSFER PROGRAM (Majority to Minority)

Schools					

Comments _____

C. FACILITIES

Type 72 Seater					
D.I.S.D.					
Mini-					

Comments _____

VI. COMMUNITY PARTICIPATION

PROGRAMS	Anglo %	Black %	M-A %	Other %	Total
P.T.A.					
P.T.S.A.					
Adopt A School					
Athletic Booster					
Parent Advisory					
Volunteer					
Parental Involvement					
Tutors					
R.I.F.					

Comments _____

GENERAL OBSERVATIONS

Comments _____

BILINGUAL

	ANGLO	BLACK	MEXICAN-AMERICAN	OTHER	TOTAL
Students	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
Teachers	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
Aides	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____

CERTIFICATION: _____ ALL _____ IN PROCESS

LANGUAGE DOMINANCE: _____ SPANISH _____ TRANSITIONAL MAINTENANCE _____

MONOLINGUAL: _____ SPANISH _____ ENGLISH

NO. OF CLASSES: _____ IN SPANISH _____ IN ENGLISH

PROVISIONS FOR ESL:

COMMENTS: _____

_____

_____

ASSESSMENT AND EVALUATION

ORAL WRITTEN DISD COMMERCIAL OTHER

COMMENTS: _____

_____

_____

MATERIALS

TYPE: AUDIOVISUAL PROGRAMMED SUPPLEMENTARY

COMMENTS: _____

_____

_____

	ANGLO	BLACK	MEXICAN-AMERICAN	OTHER	TOTAL
TUTORS	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
PARENTS	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
ADULTS	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____

COMMENTS: _____

_____

_____

_____

Teacher's Legal Name

dallas independent school district

TEACHER EVALUATION

CONFIDENTIAL

RECOMMENDATION OF PRINCIPAL:

☐ The teacher is successfully fulfilling the instructional goals as established by Board-approved curriculum as well as meeting the Professional expectations as described in this document, and is recommended for continued employment.

☐ The teacher's success in achieving the instructional goals of the District, and/or meeting the Professional expectations as outlined in this document is marginal. Continued employment is contingent upon successfully fulfilling the requirements outlined. (Appendices will be attached to this document and shall contain prescriptive remedies for the correction of performance deficiencies as determined by the principal/evaluation team.)

☐ The teacher is unsuccessful in achieving the instructional goals of the District and/or the Professional expectations as outlined in this document and therefore is recommended for dismissal.

TEACHER'S STATEMENT:

A formal conference was held on (date)_____with my principal.

I acknowledge that each of the Professional characteristics and instructional performances listed within was discussed and that specific suggestions were recommended. I understand that my signature below does not necessarily mean that I agree with the evaluation. I also understand that I have the right to discuss my status with the Assistant Superintendent — Personnel of the Dallas Independent School District.

Signed comments are attached by principal ☐ and/or teacher ☐

Date _____ Teacher's Signature _____

School _____ Teacher's Social Security No. _____

Principal's Signature _____

Teaching Assignment _____

Number of years of service, including this year, in this school _____

Current years of service, including this year, in the Dallas Independent School District _____

Total years of service in the teaching profession _____

Comments: _____

_____

I. PROFESSIONAL EVALUATION FORM

Teacher _____ School _____

I. PROFESSIONAL

	Successful	Marginal	Unsuccessful	COMMENTS
A. The teacher maintains a continuous effort to achieve professional improvement, attitudes, and conduct. Also, the teacher observes professional ethics; works cooperatively with the entire staff; seeks, shares, and respects ideas of others; refrains from revealing confidential information regarding pupils and their families.	☐	☐	☐	
B. The teacher supports established administrative policies and directives, and performs all required school routines and responsibilities on time.	☐	☐	☐	
C. The teacher's absences are minimal and do not significantly impede the learning progress of students.	☐	☐	☐	
D. The teacher is consistently fair and impartial; praise and criticism are based on fact; all criticism is constructive; individual pupils are not excessively criticized; the teacher avoids criticism which may result in any embarrassment.	☐	☐	☐	
E. The teacher sets an example of, and encourages, socially acceptable behavior (e.g., dress, correct usage of speech, and manner), which results in an educational climate free of disruption.	☐	☐	☐	
F. The teacher maintains an atmosphere conducive to freedom of thought and creative expression, and shows respect for pupil opinions and suggestions. He/She also fosters a positive self-concept in each pupil.	☐	☐	☐	
G. The teacher demonstrates and communicates a vital interest in and understanding of each pupil's social, emotional, physical, and intellectual growth.	☐	☐	☐	

	Successful	Marginal	Unsuccessful	COMMENTS
H. Classroom management is orderly and businesslike, and gives evidence of student knowledge of teacher expectations for routines and classroom procedure. The teacher resolves behavior problems with minimal disruptions to the learning climate and creates a teaching environment conducive to learning.	☐	☐	☐	
I. The teacher's condition of health enables the teacher to achieve the instructional goals of the District.	☐	☐	☐	
J. The teacher establishes and conducts a system of communication wherein the parents are able to interpret the periodic progress reports in terms of course goals, student level of achievement of these goals, reasons for student achievement, and means for continued progress.	☐	☐	☐	

I. INSTRUCTIONAL EVALUATION RATING

A. Appraisal of Original or Modified Goals (December of a school year) ☐ ☐ ☐

B. Attainment of Original or Modified Goals (March 31 of a school year) ☐ ☐ ☐

Recommended Areas for Goal Development

Exceptional Professional Accomplishments

DALLAS INDEPENDENT SCHOOL DISTRICT

SELECTION OF PRINCIPALS

The initial step in the selection of school administrators is to invite all interested personnel to take the Leadership Training Program Examination which is given annually. A copy of this application form is enclosed. The Leadership Training Program is divided in four phases. Enclosed is a copy of the Leadership Training Program Handbook, which describes the purposes of the program, the criteria of selection, and description of the four phases of the program. The personnel who successfully complete this program are interviewed by the Assistant Superintendents-Operations, the Assistant Superintendent-East Oak Cliff, and the General Superintendent of Schools. Personnel are assigned by the General Superintendent according to the vacancies which exist at the time of selection.

Principals, Assistant Principals, Resource Administrators, and Interns are evaluated according to the procedures as outlined in the enclosed Administrators Professional Evaluation booklet.

APPLICATION FORM FOR THE
LEADERSHIP TRAINING PROGRAM
1978 - 1979

Date _____ (Please type or print)

A recent photograph must be attached here

Name _____

Address _____

Telephone-School _____ Telephone-Home _____

Age _____ Sex: M F Height _____ Weight _____

Ethnic Origin _____ Marital Status _____

Social Security Number _____

DALLAS EXPERIENCE

Position	School	Principal	Subjects Taught	Years

OUTSIDE EXPERIENCE

Position	School	City	Superintendent	Years

COLLEGES ATTENDED AND DEGREES RECEIVED

College and Location	Yrs. Attended	Dates	Degrees Received

State of Texas Certification ☐ Teachers ☐ Administrators ☐ Supervisors ☐ Counselors

Present Assignment: School _____ Subject _____

Position to which you aspire _____

Will you be available during the coming summer months? _____

Have you ever taken the Administrative-Supervisory Exam? _____ If so what date _____, and where is the score on file? _____

Have you ever taken the National Teachers Exam (Commons)? _____ If so what date _____, and where is the score on file? _____

Please enclose a check for $7.00 payable to the Dallas Independent School District to cover the cost of your examinations.

NOTE:

Director - Management Academy (two copies) Box 45

Building Principal (one copy)
Retain file copy

Appendix E

ATTITUDINAL SURVEY QUESTIONNAIRE

ETS AUDIT - SPRING 1979

Date _____

Name_____ Address_____

Phone_____ Ethnicity_____

Subdistrict_____ Student Grade Level_____

School Transferred From _____

Kind of School: Check one. K-3 ( ); 4-5-6 ( ); 7-8 ( );
9-12 ( ); Academy ( ); Vanguard ( )

School Transferred To_____

Kind of School: Check one. K-3 ( ); 4-5-6 ( ); 7-8 ( );
9-12 ( ); Academy ( ); Vanguard ( )
Magnet ( )

1. Are you as a parent satisfied with your child's education progress at his school? Yes _____ No _____

   If not, why not? _____

2. Do you feel that the desegregation plan is working as well as it should be? Yes _____ No _____

   If not, why not? _____

3. Do you think that your child has benefitted in learning more about other ethnic groups through this desegration plan?
   Yes _____ No _____

4. Are you aware of the majority to minority movement currently going on within the school district? Yes _____ No _____

5. Do you think the general educational atmosphere is better now than it was before the desegregation plan began?
   Yes _____ No _____

   If not, why not? _____

6. Have you visited your child's new school? Yes _____ No _____

   If not, why not? _____

7. Are you active in parent organizations? Yes _____ No _____

   If not, why not? _____

8. Do you feel that there are enough courses being offered at your child's school to meet his/her needs? Yes _____ No _____

   If not, why not? _____

9. Do you feel that the school buildings, grounds, equipment, etc., are adequate? Yes _____ No _____

   If not, why not? _____

10. Does your child like the school that he/she is attending? Yes _____ No _____

11. Is the quality of teaching at the new school better than the quality of teaching at the old school? Yes _____ No _____

    If not, why not? _____

12. Is the quality of the administration at the new school better than the quality of administration at the old school? Yes _____ No _____

    If not, why not? _____

13. Are the transportation facilities adequate? Yes _____ No _____

    If not, why not? _____

14. Are there fewer discipline problems at the new school in comparison to those discipline problems at the old school? Yes _____ No _____

15. Are punishments less severe at the new school? Yes _____ No _____

16. Is the curriculum at the new school meeting your expectations and your child's needs? Yes _____ No _____

    If not, why not? _____

17. Are the extracurricular offerings at the school sufficient? Yes _____ No _____

    If not, why not? _____

18. Is your child able to participate in these extracurricular offerings? Yes _____ No _____

    If not, why not? _____

OFFICE MEMO

Appendix F

DALLAS INDEPENDENT SCHOOL DISTRICT
SCHOOL ADMINISTRATION BUILDING 3700 ROSS AVE.

May 21, 1979

COPY

To: Robert Johnston, Administrative Assistant

Subject: Errata for Court Report

Enclosed are the correct pages as per your request.

Sincerely,

Wayne R. Applebaum
Senior Evaluator
Court Ordered Reporting

WRA/b
encls

FICE MEMO

DALLAS INDEPENDENT SCHOOL DISTRICT
SCHOOL ADMINISTRATION BUILDING 3700 ROSS AVE.

May 10, 1979

To: Robert L. Johnston, Administrative Assistant

Subject: Errata for Court Report

Upon review of the enrollment figures for the District's Vanguard schools, it was discovered that the enrollments for grades K-3 were inadvertently included in the enrollments reported for the Sidney Lanier and Mark Twain Vanguard schools. This occurred in both the December and April reports. The correct figures are as follows:

		Anglo		Black		M-A		
		No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	Total
December:	Lanier	115	24.2	77	16.2	283	59.6	475
	Twain	87	26.4	233	70.6	10	3.0	330
April:	Lanier	109	22.5	85	17.5	291	60.0	485
	Twain	88	26.4	233	70.6	10	3.0	333

It should be noted that although these percentages are somewhat closer to the court-ordered ratio than the ones originally reported they do not differ enough from the percentages originally reported to warrant any reinterpretation of the results.

Sincerely,

Wayne R. Applebaum

Wayne R. Applebaum
Senior Evaluator
Court Ordered Reporting

WRA/b

Vanguard Schools (Grades 4-6)

School	Anglo No.	Anglo %	Black No.	Black %	M-A No.	M-A %	Total
Amelia Earhart	63	30.6	97	47.1	46	22.3	206
Maynard Jackson	10	1.5	637	97.7	5	0.8	652
Sidney Lanier	115	24.2	77	16.2	283	59.6	475
K. B. Polk	86	70.5	31	25.4	5	4.1	122
Mark Twain	87	26.4	233	70.6	10	3.0	330

Academies (Grades 7-8)

School	Anglo No.	Anglo %	Black No.	Black %	M-A No.	M-A %	Total
P.C. Anderson	137	38.7	193	54.5	24	6.8	354
W. H. Atwell	231	33.1	379	54.3	88	12.6	698
O. W. Holmes	77	31.4	156	63.7	12	4.9	245
Sequoyah	71	41.5	83	48.5	17	9.9	171
Alex W. Spence	79	65.3	28	23.1	14	11.6	121

Magnet Schools (Full-time and Part-time Students)

School	Anglo No.	Anglo %	Black No.	Black %	M-A No.	M-A %	Total
Business & Management	123	9.8	949	75.7	181	14.5	1,253
Arts Magnet	303	44.0	326	47.4	59	8.6	688
Health Profession	204	25.7	521	65.6	69	8.7	794
Transportation	133	24.1	318	57.5	102	18.4	553
Human Services	70	49.7	59	41.8	12	8.5	141
Public Services	99	41.3	84	35.0	57	23.7	240

All data reported in paragraph 1 are current as of November 14, 1978

Vanguard Schools (Grades 4-6)

School	Anglo No.	Anglo %	Black No.	Black %	M-A No.	M-A %	Total
Amelia Earhart	63	31.3	95	47.3	43	21.4	201
Maynard Jackson	11	1.7	646	98.3	2	0.3	659
Sidney Lanier	109	22.5	85	17.5	291	60.0	485
K. B. Polk	84	70.6	30	25.2	5	4.2	119
Mark Twain	88	26.4	233	70.6	10	3.0	333

Academies (Grades 7-8)

School	Anglo No.	Anglo %	Black No.	Black %	M-A No.	M-A %	Total
P.C. Anderson	124	36.9	188	56.0	24	7.1	336
W. H. Atwell	219	31.7	388	56.2	83	12.0	690
W. E. Greiner	431	36.9	163	14.0	573	49.1	1,167
O. W. Holmes	71	29.7	166	65.3	4	1.7	239
Sequoyah	72	42.4	81	47.6	17	10.0	170
A. W. Spence	76	65.0	29	24.8	12	10.3	117

Magnet Schools (Full-time and Part-time Students)

School	Anglo No.	Anglo %	Black No.	Black %	M-A No.	M-A %	Total
Business & Management	114	9.5	907	75.6	179	14.9	1,200
Arts Magnet at Booker T. Washington	299	45.7	302	46.2	53	8.1	654
Health Professions	193	25.6	497	66.0	63	8.3	753
Transportation	119	23.3	294	57.6	97	19.0	510
Human Services	64	47.4	58	43.0	13	9.6	135
Public Services	86	42.2	75	36.8	43	21.0	204

All data reported in paragraph 1 are current as of March 1, 1979

OFFICE MEMO

Appendix G

DALLAS INDEPENDENT SCHOOL DISTRICT
SCHOOL ADMINISTRATION BUILDING 3700 ROSS AVE

April 30, 1979

To: Robert Johnston, Administrative Assistant

Subject: Errata for Court Report

On the April 15, 1979 Report add to page 31, the following:

Thomas Jefferson High School	Renovation and establishment of math, science, industrial arts, and other laboratories	Completed
David W. Carter High School	Renovation and establishment of math, science, industrial arts, and other laboratories	Completed

In addition, this revised page should be inserted between pages 29 and 30 of the December 15, 1978 report where it had been inadvertently omitted.

On page 33 of the April report and page 31 of the December report the sentence reading:

The sixteen projects listed above...

should read:

The twenty-five projects listed above...

I apologize for any inconvenience that these errors might have caused.

Sincerely,

Wayne R. Applebaum
Senior Evaluator -
Court Ordered Reporting

WRA/b